arXiv:math/0212249v1 [math.LO] 18 Dec 2002

MIDDLE DIAMOND

Saharon Shelah

Institute of Mathematics
The Hebrew University
Jerusalem, Israel

Rutgers University
Mathematics Department
New Brunswick, NJ USA

Abstract. Under some cardinal arithmetic assumptions, we prove that many stationary subsets of λ of a right cofinality has the "middle diamond". In particular, for many regular κ for every large enough regular λ we have the middle diamond on $\{\delta < \lambda : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \kappa\}$. This is a strong negation of uniformization.

Key words and phrases. Set theory, Normal ideals, Middle Diamond, Weak Diamond.

I would like to thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.
This research was partially supported by the Israel Science Foundation. Publication 775

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$-TEX

Annotated Content

§0 Introduction

[We state concise versions of the main results: provably in ZFC, for many triples $(\lambda, \Upsilon, \kappa)$ where $\kappa < \lambda$ are regular, $\Upsilon < \lambda$ we can give for any $\delta \in S^\lambda_\kappa$ a function f_δ from some subset C_δ of δ of order type κ unbounded in δ into Υ such that any $f : \lambda \to \Upsilon$ extends f_δ for stationarily many δ's. We also review some history.]

§1 Middle Diamond: sufficient conditions

[We define families of relevant sequences $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ and properties needed for phrasing and proving our results (see Definition 1.5) and give easy implications; (later 1.19, 1.22 we define other versions of middle diamond). Then (in 1.9) prove a version of the middle diamond for $(\lambda, \Upsilon, \theta, \kappa)$ guessing only the colour of $f \restriction C_\delta$ when $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(2^\mu)$, the number of possible colours, θ, is not too large and κ belongs to a not so small set of regular cardinals $\kappa < \mu$ (e.g., every large enough regular $\kappa < \beth_\omega$ if $\beth_\omega \leq \mu$). The demand on κ says 2^μ is not the number of κ-branches of a tree with $< 2^\mu$ nodes. We then prove that a requirement on (μ, θ) is reasonable (see 1.10, 1.12, 1.13). In 1.18 we get the version of middle diamond giving $f \restriction C_\delta$ from the apparently weaker one guessing only the colour of $f \restriction C_\delta$. We quote various needed results and definitions in 1.3, 1.21.]

§2 Upgrading to large cardinals

[Here we try to get such results for "many" large enough regular λ. We succeed to get it for every large enough not strongly inaccessible cardinal. We prove upgrading: i.e., give sufficient conditions for deducing middle diamond on λ_2 from ones on $\lambda_1 < \lambda$ (see 2.1) and 2.2 (many disjoint ones), 2.9, 2.10). We deduce (in 2.3) results of the form "if λ is large enough satisfying a weak requirement, then it has middle diamond "for quite many κ, θ, using upgrading claims the results of §1 and generalization of [EK] (see 2.4, 2.5, 2.6). We deal with such theorem more than necessary just for the upgrading.]

§3 Catching more cofinalities

[We would like in the major claim to get e.g., "for every regular uncountable $\kappa < \beth_\omega$ "rather than just for every large enough such κ". We give sufficient

conditions of two kinds. One uses weak reflection, the other starts by a weak square. Note that if some major question in pcf theory gets a positive result in ZFC then we can prove such results in ZFC; we can hope that this is provable in ZFC as the assumption is reasonable, the negation seems quite wild. We end noting that we could have used colouring of $f : [\lambda]^{<\aleph_0} \to \Upsilon$.]

§4 Further upgrading

[We return to §2. We may like to weaken the demand on μ in 0.2 + 1.5. We give a new version of 2.8 (in 4.1), so give more in 0.1. We then try to deal with strongly inaccessible cardinals, we show that the existence of bad stationary sets help.]

§5 Relative of $I[\lambda]$

§6 Relative of ♣

§0 Introduction

Using the diamond (discovered by Jensen [J]) we can construct many objects; wonderful but there is a price - we must assume $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{L}$ or at least instances of G.C.H. (see [Sh 460] and citations there).
Naturally we would like to get the benefit without paying the price. A way to do this is to use the weak diamond (see [DvSh 65], [Sh:f, AP,§1], [Sh 208], [Sh 638] and lately [Sh 755]).
In the diamond principle for a stationary $S \subseteq \lambda$, for $\delta \in S$ we guess $\eta \restriction \delta$ for $\eta \in {}^{\lambda}2$. In the weak diamond, for stationary $S \subseteq \lambda$ for $\delta \in S$ we do not guess $\eta \restriction \delta$ for $\eta \in {}^{\lambda}2$, we just guess whether it satisfies a property - is black or white, i.e. $\mathbf{F}(\eta \restriction \delta) \in \{0,1\}$ for a pre-given $\mathbf{F}$. Many times it is just enough in the construction using diamond to "avoid undesirable company": whatever you will do I will do otherwise. This is, of course, a considerably weaker principle, but for $\aleph_1$ it follows from CH (which does not imply $\diamondsuit_{\aleph_1}$) and even WCH (i.e. $2^{\aleph_0} < 2^{\aleph_1}$). In fact, it holds for many cardinals: $2^\lambda > 2^{<\lambda} = 2^\theta$ suffices. Having $\mathbf{F}$ with two colours (= values) seemed essential. In [Sh 638], we get more colours for $\aleph_1$ if the club filter on ω_1 is saturated but this is a heavy assumption. In [Sh 755], if $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda} = 2^\mu$, it is proved that for "many" regular $\kappa < \lambda$, if $S \subseteq \{\delta < \lambda : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \kappa\}$ is stationary then we have the weak diamond for S. Now what does "many" mean? For example, if $\lambda \geq \beth_\omega$, "many" include every large enough regular $\kappa < \beth_\omega$; note that it is for "every stationary S" unlike the situation, e.g. for $\aleph_1$ under CH (see [Sh:f, V]). We get there more cases if the coloring $\mathbf{F}$ on ${}^{\delta}2$ depends only on $\eta \restriction C_\delta$, where $C_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(C_\delta)$ and C_δ is "small".
Here we get more than two colours and moreover: we guess $\eta \restriction C_\delta, C_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(C_\delta)$ and so $M \restriction C_\delta$ is M_δ. Of course, if $(\exists \mu < \lambda)[2^\mu > \lambda]$ then we cannot have $C_\delta = \delta$ so this is a very reasonable restriction. (It would be even better to have $M_\delta \prec M$ below but we do not know). Also for very many λ large enough the result holds for many regular κ.

The motivation has been trying to get better principles provably in ZFC.
We use partial squares and $I[\lambda]$, see [Sh 108], [AShS 221], [Sh 237e], [Sh 420, §1] and [DjSh 562]. We prove (in fact this holds for quite "many" stationary $S \subseteq S^\lambda_\kappa$).

0.1 Theorem. *For every μ strong limit of uncountable cofinality, for every regular $\lambda > \mu$ not strongly inaccessible, for every large enough regular $\kappa < \mu$, we have the following middle diamond: (called later MD-property)*

$\boxplus_{\lambda,\kappa}$ *for some stationary $S \subseteq \{\delta < \lambda : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \kappa\}$ for every relational vocabulary τ of cardinality $< \mu$ (so τ has no function symbols) and $\chi < \mu$ we can find $\bar{M} = \langle M_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ such that*

- *(a) M_δ is a τ-model*

(b) *the universe of M_δ is an unbounded subset of δ of order type $\chi \times \kappa$ including χ*

(c) *if M is a τ-model with universe λ then for stationarily many $\delta \in S$ we have $M_\delta \subseteq M$.*

It seems that this is stronger in sufficient measure from the weak diamond to justify this name and we have to put the line somewhere. We shall use the adjective middle diamond to describe even cases with colouring with more than two values (justified by 1.18).

I thank Todd Eisworth for his helpful comments.

0.2 Theorem. *In 0.1 we can have also $\bar{f} = \langle f_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ where $f_\delta : u_\delta \to \delta, u_\delta \subseteq \delta, \lambda^{|u_\delta|} = \lambda$ such that:*

(d) *if M is a τ-model with universe λ and $f : \lambda \to \lambda$ and $u \subseteq \lambda, \lambda^{|u|} = \lambda$, then for stationarily many $\delta \in S$ we have $M_\delta \subseteq M$ & $(f_\delta = f \restriction u \subseteq f)$.*

Proof of 0.1 and 0.2. By 2.8(1) if $\lambda > \mu$ is regular not strongly inaccessible, then for every large enough regular $\kappa < \mu$ the following holds:

$(*)_\kappa$ if $\theta < \mu$ then some $(\lambda, \kappa, \kappa^+)$-parameter $\bar{C}$ has the θ-Md property; let $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$.

Now without loss of generality $\delta \in S \Rightarrow (\chi \times \theta)^\omega | \delta$, and let $C'_\delta = \{\gamma : \gamma < \chi$ or $(\exists \beta \in C_\delta)(\beta \le \gamma < \beta + \chi)$.
Lastly, let $\theta = 2^{\chi+\kappa+|\tau|}$ and by 1.18 we get the conclusion of 0.1.

As for 0.2, Clause (d) is easy by having a pairwise disjoint sequence of suitable $\langle S_i : i < \lambda\rangle$ which holds by 2.8(2). $\square_{0.1}$ $\square_{0.2}$

Note that having M_δ's is deduced in 1.18 from the θ-Md-property with θ large enough. Note that 0.1 has obvious applications on various constructions, e.g., construction of abelian groups G with $\mathrm{Ext}(G, K) \neq \emptyset$.

Note that in 0.1, ?, 2.8 instead of using "large enough $\kappa < \mu \ldots$", μ strong limit and quoting [Sh 460] we can specifically write what we use on κ (and on θ). Also in 0.1, if we omit $\mathrm{cf}(\mu) > \aleph_0$ (but still μ is uncountable) the case λ successor is not affected, and in the case $\mu = \beth_\delta$ when ω^2 divides δ, the statement instead "every large enough κ" can be replaced by "for arbitrarily large regular $\kappa < \mu$", or even: "for arbitrarily large strong limit $\mu' < \mu$, for every large enough regular $\kappa < \mu'$".
A consequence is (see more on this principle in [Sh 667]).

0.3 Conclusion. 1) If $\lambda, \kappa, \chi, S, \langle M_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ are as in 0.1 and $\gamma < \kappa \vee \gamma < \chi$, then we can find $\bar\eta = \langle \eta_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle, \eta_\delta$ is an increasing sequence of length κ of ordinals $< \delta$ with limit δ such that:

- $\boxplus$ if $F : \lambda \to \gamma$, then for stationarily many $\delta \in S$ we have $i < \kappa \Rightarrow F(\eta_\delta(2i)) = F(\eta_\delta(2i+1))$.

2) In fact it is enough to find a (λ, κ, χ)-Md-parameter $\langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ which has the $(\gamma, 2^{|\gamma|})$-Md-property (see Definition 1.5(5B)).

Note that if a natural quite weak conjecture on pcf holds, then we can replace $\beth_\omega$ by $\aleph_\omega$ (and similar changes) in most places but still need $\lambda > \lambda_1 > \lambda_\delta, 2^{\lambda_1} > 2^{\lambda_0} \geq 2^{\aleph_\omega}$ in the stepping-up lemma; e.g. for every regular large enough λ, for some n, we have middle diamond with λ_0 colours on $S^\lambda_{\aleph_n}$ - is helpful for abelian group theory. (Under weak conditions we get this for $\aleph_0$, see end of §3).

Even without this conjecture it is quite hard to have the negation of this statement as it restricts 2^μ and $\mathrm{cf}(2^\mu)$ for every μ!

0.4 Definition. 1) Let "$S \subseteq \lambda$ have square" mean that (λ is regular uncountable, S a stationary subset of λ and): for some club E of λ and $S', S \cap E \subseteq S' \subseteq \lambda$ and there is a witness $\bar C$ which means $\bar C = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S'\rangle, C_\delta \subseteq \delta$ is closed, $[\delta \in S'$ limit $\Rightarrow \delta = \sup(C_\delta)], [\alpha \in C_\delta \Rightarrow C_\alpha = \alpha \cap C_\delta]$ and $\delta \in S \Rightarrow \ \mathrm{otp}(C_\delta) < \delta$.
2) If we replace square by $(\leq \kappa)$-square this means we add $\mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha) \leq \kappa$.
3) We say $(\leq \kappa, \Theta)$-square if above the demand $\alpha \in C_\delta \Rightarrow C_\alpha = \alpha \cap C_\delta$ is restricted to the case $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha) \in \Theta$.
4) $S^\lambda_\kappa = \{\delta < \lambda : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \kappa\}$.

Clearly 1.9 and some results later continue Engelking Karlowic [EK] which continue works on density of some topological spaces, see more history in [Sh 420].

§1 Middle Diamond: Sufficient conditions for $\mathrm{cf}(2^\mu)$

1.1 Definition. For regular uncountable λ,

(1) we say $S \subseteq \lambda$ is (Υ,θ)-small if it is $\mathbf{F}$-(Υ,θ)-small for some $(\lambda,\Upsilon,\theta)$-colouring $\mathbf{F}$, also called a θ-colouring of ${}^{\lambda>}\Upsilon$, that is: a function $\mathbf{F}$ from ${}^{\lambda>}\Upsilon$ to θ where

(2) we say $S \subseteq \lambda$ is $\mathbf{F}-(\Upsilon,\theta)$-small, if ($\mathbf{F}$ is a θ-colouring of ${}^{\lambda>}\Upsilon$ and)

$(*)^\theta_{\mathbf{F},S}$ for every $\bar c \in {}^S\theta$ for some $\eta \in {}^\lambda\Upsilon$ the set $\{\delta \in S : \mathbf{F}(\eta \restriction \delta) = c_\delta\}$ is not stationary.

(3) Let $D^{\rm md}_{\lambda,\Upsilon,\theta} = \{A \subseteq \lambda : \lambda \setminus A$ is (Υ,θ)-small$\}$, we call it the (Υ,θ)-middle diamond filter on λ.

(4) We omit Υ if $\Upsilon = \theta$, writing[1] θ instead of (Υ,θ). We may omit θ from "S is $\mathbf{F}-\theta$-small", and $(*)^\theta_{\mathbf{F},S}$ when clear from the context.
If $\theta = 2$ we call this weak diamond filter and may write $D^{\rm wd}_{\lambda,\Upsilon}$.

1.2 Claim. *1) If $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) > \aleph_0, \lambda \geq \Upsilon \geq 2$ and $\lambda \geq \theta$ then $D^{\rm md}_{\lambda,\Upsilon,\theta}$ is a normal filter on λ.*
2) Assume $S \subseteq \lambda, 2 \leq \Upsilon_\ell \leq \lambda, 2 \leq \theta \leq \lambda$ for $\ell = 1,2$. Then S is (Υ_1,θ)-small iff S is (Υ_2,θ)-small[2].
3) In fact $\Upsilon_\ell \in [2, 2^{<\lambda}]$ is enough.

Proof. As in [Sh:f, AP,§1]. $\square_{1.2}$

Recall

1.3 Definition. 1) Let $\chi^{<\sigma>} = \mathrm{Min}\{|\mathscr{P}| : \mathscr{P} \subseteq [\chi]^\sigma$ and every $A \in [\chi]^\sigma$ is included in the union of $< \sigma$ members of $\mathscr{P}\}$.
2) $\chi^{<\sigma>_{\rm tr}} = \sup\{|\lim_\sigma(t)| : t$ is a tree with $\leq \chi$ nodes and σ levels$\}$.
3) $\mathbf{U}_J(\mu) = \mathrm{Min}\{|\mathscr{P}| : \mathscr{P} \subseteq [\mu]^\theta$ and for every $f : \mathrm{Dom}(J) \to \mu$ for some $u \in \mathscr{P}$ we have $\{i \in \mathrm{Dom}(J) : f(i) \in u\} \neq \emptyset \bmod J\}$ where J is an ideal on $\mathrm{Dom}(J)$. If $J = [\theta]^{<\theta}$ we may write θ instead of J.
4) Let $\chi^{[\sigma]} = \mathrm{Min}\{|\mathscr{P}| : \mathscr{P} \subseteq [\chi]^\sigma$ and every $A \in [\chi]^\sigma$ is equal to union of $< \sigma$ members of $\mathscr{P}\}$.

[1] this is the weak diamond case
[2] so Υ seems immaterial, but below using $\bar C$ this is not so

1.4 Remark. 1) On $\chi^{<\sigma>_{\rm tr}}$ see [Sh 589], on $\chi^{<\sigma>}$ see [Sh 430], on $\chi^{<\sigma>}, \chi^{[\sigma]}$ see there and in [Sh 460] but no real knowledge is assumed here.
2) Note that when $\Upsilon = \lambda$ only $\mathbf{F} \restriction \{{}^{\delta}\delta : \delta \in S\}$ was really used. So we can restrict the colorings to this set.

Below we may restrict ourselves to $\Upsilon = \lambda$. But if $\mu < \lambda = \ {\rm cf}(\lambda), 2^{\mu} = 2^{\lambda}$ even for $\theta = \Upsilon = 2$, the set λ is small (as noted by Uri Abraham, see [DvSh 65]).

1.5 Definition. 1) We say $\bar{C}$ is a λ-Md-parameter <u>if</u>:

- (a) λ is regular uncountable,
- (b) S a stationary subset of λ,
- (c) $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ and[3] $C_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(C_\delta)$.

1A) We say $\bar{C}$ is a (λ, κ, χ)-Md-parameter <u>if</u> in addition $(\forall \delta \in S)[{\rm cf}(\delta) = \kappa \wedge |C_\delta| < \chi]$.
2) We say that $\mathbf{F}$ is a $(\bar{C}, \Upsilon, \theta)$-colouring if: $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ is a λ-Md-parameter and $\mathbf{F}$ is a function from ${}^{\lambda >}\Upsilon$ to θ such that:

if $\delta \in S$ and $\eta_0, \eta_1 \in {}^{\delta}\Upsilon$ and $\eta_0 \restriction C_\delta = \eta_1 \restriction C_\delta$ then $\mathbf{F}(\eta_0) = \mathbf{F}(\eta_1)$.

2A) If $\Upsilon = \theta$ we may omit it and write $(\bar{C}, \theta)$-colouring.
2B) In part (2) we can replace $\mathbf{F}$ by $\bar{F} = \langle F_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ where $F_\delta : {}^{(C_\delta)}\Upsilon \to \theta$ such that $\eta \in {}^{\delta}\delta \wedge \delta \in S \to \mathbf{F}(\eta) = F_\delta(\eta \restriction C_\delta)$. If $\Upsilon = \lambda$ we may use $F_\delta : {}^{(C_\delta)}\delta \to \theta$ (as we can ignore a non-stationary $S' \subseteq S$). So abusing notation we may write $\mathbf{F}(\eta \restriction C_\delta)$. Similarly if ${\rm cf}(\Upsilon) = \lambda, \langle \Upsilon_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ is increasing continuous we may restrict ourselves to ${}^{(C_\delta)}(\Upsilon_\delta)$.
3) Assume $\mathbf{F}$ is a $(\bar{C}, \Upsilon, \theta)$-colouring, where $\bar{C}$ is a λ-Md-parameter.
We say $\bar{c} \in {}^{S}\theta$ (or $\bar{c} \in {}^{\lambda}\theta$) is an $\mathbf{F}$-middle diamond sequence, or an $\mathbf{F}$-Md-sequence if:

- $(*)$ for every $\eta \in {}^{\lambda}\Upsilon$, the set $\{\delta \in S : \mathbf{F}(\eta \restriction \delta) = c_\delta\}$ is a stationary subset of λ.

We also may say $\bar{c}$ is an $(\mathbf{F}, S)$-Md-sequence or an $(\mathbf{F}, \bar{C})$-Md-sequence.
3A) We say $\bar{c} \in {}^{S}\theta$ is a $D - \mathbf{F}$-Md-sequence <u>if</u> D is a filter on λ to which S belongs and

- $(*)$ for every $\eta \in {}^{\lambda}\Upsilon$ we have

$$\{\delta \in S : \mathbf{F}(\eta \restriction \delta) = c_\delta\} \neq \emptyset \bmod D.$$

[3] we can omit it but then we trivially have middle diamond if $\lambda = \lambda^{<\kappa}$ when $\kappa = \cup\{|C_\delta|^+ : \delta \in S\}$

4) We say $\bar{C}$ is a good (λ,λ_1)-Md-parameter, if $\bar{C}$ is a λ-Md-parameter and for every $\alpha<\lambda$ we have $\lambda_1>|\{C_\delta\cap\alpha:\delta\in S\ \ \&\ \ \alpha\in C_\delta\}|$. If $\lambda_1=\lambda$ we may write "good λ-Md-parameter". Similarly for $(\lambda,\lambda_1,\kappa,\chi)$-good-Md-parameter and (λ,κ,χ)-good-Md-parameter (i.e. adding $\bar{C}$ is a (λ,κ,χ)-Md-parameter.
4A) We say $\bar{C}$ is weakly good λ-Md-parameter if it is a λ-Md-parameter and for every $\alpha<\lambda$ we have $\lambda>|\{C_\delta\cap\alpha:\delta\in S\ \ \&\ \ \alpha\in\ \mathrm{nacc}(C_\delta)\}|$. Similarly a weakly good (λ,κ,χ)-Md-parameter.
4B) We say $\bar{C}$ is good$^+-\lambda$-Md-parameter if $\bar{C}=\langle C_\delta:\delta\in S\rangle$ is a λ-Md-parameter and $\alpha\in C_{\delta_1}\cap C_{\delta_2}\Rightarrow C_{\delta_1}\cap\alpha=C_{\delta_2}\cap\alpha$. Similarly good$^+-(\lambda,\kappa,\chi)$-Md-parameter.
4C) We define weakly good$^+-\lambda$-Md-parameter or (λ,κ,χ)-Md-parameter parallely, i.e., $\alpha\in\ \mathrm{nacc}(C_{\delta_1})\cap\ \mathrm{nacc}(C_{\delta_2})\Rightarrow C_{\delta_1}\cap\delta_1=C_{\delta_2}\cap\delta_1$.

1.6 Definition. 1) We say $\bar{C}$ has the (D,Υ,θ)-Md-property if

- (a) $\bar{C}$ is a λ-Md-parameter
- (b) D a filter on λ
- (c) if $\mathbf{F}$ is a $(\bar{C},\Upsilon,\theta)$-colouring, then there is a $D-\mathbf{F}$-Md-sequence, see Definition 1.5, part (3A).

2) We say that $\bar{C}$ has the (D,θ)-Md-property as in part (1) only $\mathbf{F}$ is a $(\bar{C},\theta,\theta)$-colouring. We may omit D if D is the club filter. We may omit θ if $\theta=2$.
3) We say $S\subseteq\lambda$ has the (Υ,θ)-Md-property mean that some $\bar{C}=\langle C_\delta:\delta\in S\rangle$ has, and we say the θ-Md-property if $\Upsilon=\theta$.

1.7 Remark. We may consider replacing C_δ by (C_δ,D_δ), D_δ a filter on C_δ, that is $F_\delta(\eta)$ depend on $(\eta\restriction C_\delta)/D_\delta$ only. For the time being it does not make a real difference.

1.8 Claim. *1) The restrictions in 1.5*(2B) *are O.K.*
2) In Definition 1.5(4)*, if $\lambda_1>\lambda$ then goodness holds trivially.*
3) If $\bar{C}=\langle C_\delta:\delta\in S\rangle$ is a weakly good (λ,κ,χ)-parameter, then for some club C of λ there is $\bar{C}'=\langle C'_\delta:\delta\in S\cap E\rangle$ which is a good$^+$ (λ,κ,χ)-parameter.

Proof. Easy. (Note that the C'_δ's is not required to be a club of δ). Concerning part (3), see [Sh 420, §1]). $\square_{1.8}$

1.9 The Main Claim. *1) Assume*

(a) $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(2^\mu), D$ *is a* μ^+*-complete filter on* λ *extending the club filter*

(b) $\kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) < \chi \leq \lambda$

(c) $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ *is a* (λ, κ, χ)*-good-Md-parameter, or just weakly good or a* $(\lambda, 2^\mu, \kappa, \chi)$*-good-Md-parameter*[4]*, and* $S \in D$

(d) $2^{<\chi} \leq 2^\mu$ *and* $\theta \leq \mu$

(e) $\alpha < 2^\mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{<\kappa>_{\rm tr}} < 2^\mu$

(f) $\mathscr{F}$ *is a family of functions from* ${}^\mu\theta$ *to* θ *such that:*

  (α) $|\mathscr{F}| \leq \mu$

  (β) *for some* $\Upsilon = \mathrm{cf}(\Upsilon) \leq 2^\mu$*, if* $\bar{j} = \langle j_f : f \in \mathscr{F}\rangle \in {}^{\mathscr{F}}\theta$ *then*[5] $\Upsilon > |\{\nu \in {}^\mu\theta : (\forall f \in \mathscr{F})[j_f \neq f(\nu)]\}|$

  [*By Definition 1.12 below this means exactly* $\mathrm{Sep}(\mu, \theta)$.]

Then $\bar{C}$ *has the* (D, λ, θ)*-Md-property* (*recall that this means that the number of colours is* θ *not just 2*).
2) Moreover, $\bar{C}$ *has the* $(D, 2^\mu, \theta)$*-Md-property.*

We may wonder if clause (f) of the assumption is reasonable; the following Claim gives some sufficient conditions.

1.10 Claim. *Clause* (f) *of 1.9 holds, i.e.,* $\mathrm{Sep}(\mu, \theta)$ *holds, if at least one of the following holds:*

(a) $\mu = \mu^\theta$

(b) $\mathbf{U}_\theta(\mu) = \mu + 2^\theta = \mu$,

(c) $\mathbf{U}_J(\mu) = \mu, J = [\sigma]^{<\theta}, \theta \leq \sigma, 2^{<\sigma} < \mu$

(d) μ *is strong limit of cofinality* $\neq \theta = \mathrm{cf}(\theta) < \mu$

(e) $\mu \geq \beth_\omega(\theta)$.

We shall prove this later.

1.11 Remark. 1) Note that $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda} = \chi, \kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) < \lambda, S = S^\lambda_\kappa, C_\delta = \delta$ is a reasonable case and that $\langle C_\delta : \delta \in S^\lambda_\kappa\rangle$ is a $(\lambda, \kappa, \lambda)$-good Md-parameter.
2) We can replace κ by $*$ meaning $[\delta \in S \Rightarrow \delta$ is a regular cardinal]. Then "$|\alpha|^{<\kappa>_{\rm tr}} < 2^\mu$" is replaced by "$\delta \in S \Rightarrow \delta^{<\delta>_{\rm tr}} < 2^\mu$".

[4] so if $2^\mu > \lambda$, i.e., 2^μ is singular then the goodness holds trivially for any (λ, κ, χ)-Md-parameter
[5] so if 2^μ is regular, $\Upsilon = 2^\mu$ is fine

3) We may consider finding a guessing sequence $\bar{c}$ simultaneously for many colourings. In the notation of [Sh:f, AP,§1] this is the same as having large $\mu(0)$. We may reconsider the problem of λ^+-entangled linear ordering where $\lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0}$, see [Sh 462].
4) For $\theta = 2$, (i.e. weak diamond) the proof below can be simplified: we can forget $\mathscr{F}$ and choose $\varrho_\delta \in {}^\mu\theta \backslash \{\rho_\eta : \eta \in \mathscr{P}_\delta\}$ such that for some $i < \mu$ the sequence $\langle \varrho_\delta(i) : \delta \in S\rangle$ is a weak diamond sequence for $\mathbf{F}$.
5) Note that the "minimal" natural choices for getting θ-MD property are $\kappa = \aleph_0, \theta = 2^{\aleph_0}, \mu = 2^\theta, \lambda = \operatorname{cf}(2^\mu)$.

Proof of 1.9. Let $\mathbf{F}$ be a given $(\bar{C}, 2^\mu, \theta)$-colouring.

Let $\mathscr{F} = \{f_\xi : \xi < \mu\}$ where $\mathscr{F}$ is from clause (f) of our assumptions, and for $\rho \in {}^\mu\theta$ let $\operatorname{Sol}_\rho =: \{\nu \in {}^\mu\theta :$ for every $\varepsilon < \mu$ we have $\rho(\varepsilon) \neq f_\varepsilon(\nu)\}$ where Sol stands for solutions, so by our assumption $(f)(\beta)$ it follows that $\rho \in {}^\mu\theta \Rightarrow |\operatorname{Sol}_\rho| < \Upsilon$.

Let h be an increasing continuous function from λ into 2^μ with unbounded range. Let cd be a one-to-one function from ${}^\mu(2^\mu)$ onto 2^μ such that, for simplicity, and without loss of generality we have

$$\alpha = \operatorname{cd}(\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu\rangle) \Rightarrow \alpha \geq \sup\{\alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu\}$$

and let the function $\operatorname{cd}_i : 2^\mu \to 2^\mu$ for $i < \mu$ be such that $\operatorname{cd}_i(\langle \operatorname{cd}(\alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu)\rangle) = \alpha_i$; recall $\lambda = \operatorname{cf}(2^\mu) \geq \chi$.

Let $\mathscr{C} = \{C_\delta \cap \alpha : \delta \in S$ and $\alpha \in C_\delta\}$, recall that $|\mathscr{C}| \leq \lambda \leq 2^\mu$ and let $T = \{\eta :$ for some $C \in \mathscr{C}$ (hence C is of cardinality $< \chi$), we have $\eta \in {}^C(2^\mu)\}$, so by assumptions (c) + (d) clearly $|T| = \sum\limits_{C \in \mathscr{C}} 2^{\mu \cdot |C|} \leq |\mathscr{C}| \times (2^\mu)^{<\chi} \leq 2^\mu$ but $|T| \geq 2^\mu$ hence $|T| = 2^\mu$, so let us list T with no repetitions as $\{\eta_\alpha : \alpha < 2^\mu\}$ and let $T_{<\alpha} = \{\eta_\beta : \beta < h(\alpha)\}$ for $\alpha < \lambda$. For $\delta \in S$ let $\mathscr{P}_\delta =: \{\eta : \eta$ is a function from C_δ into $h(\delta)$ such that for every $\alpha \in C_\delta$ we have $\eta \restriction (C_\delta \cap \alpha) \in T_{<\delta}\}$.

As $\bar{C}$ is a (λ, κ, χ)-Md-parameter we have $\delta \in S \Rightarrow \operatorname{cf}(\delta) = \kappa$. So by clause (e) of our assumptions necessarily $\mathscr{P}_\delta$ has cardinality $< 2^\mu$. For each $\eta \in \mathscr{P}_\delta$ and $\varepsilon < \mu$ we define $\nu_{\eta,\varepsilon} \in {}^{C_\delta}(h(\delta))$ by $\nu_{\eta,\varepsilon}(\alpha) = \operatorname{cd}_\varepsilon(\eta(\alpha))$ for $\alpha \in C_\delta$. Now for $\eta \in \mathscr{P}_\delta$, clearly $\rho_\eta =: \langle \mathbf{F}(\nu_{\eta,\varepsilon}) : \varepsilon < \mu\rangle$ belongs to ${}^\mu\theta$; see end of 1.2(2B). Clearly $\{\rho_\eta : \eta \in \mathscr{P}_\delta\}$ is a subset of ${}^\mu\theta$ of cardinality $\leq |\mathscr{P}_\delta|$ which as said above is $< 2^\mu$. Recall the definition of Sol_ρ from the beginning of the proof and remember clause (f)(β) of the assumption of our claim 1.9, so $\eta \in \mathscr{P}_\delta \Rightarrow \operatorname{Sol}_{\rho_\eta}$ has cardinality $< \Upsilon = \operatorname{cf}(\Upsilon) \leq 2^\mu$, so we can find $\varrho^*_\delta \in {}^\mu\theta \setminus \cup\{\operatorname{Sol}_{\rho_\eta} : \eta \in \mathscr{P}_\delta\}$. Clearly $\{\eta \restriction (C_\delta \cap \alpha) : \alpha \in C_\delta\}$ is naturally a tree with $\mathscr{P}_\delta$ the set of κ-branches and set of nodes $\subseteq T_{<\delta}$ hence with $< \lambda$ nodes.

For each $\varepsilon < \mu$ recall that $\varrho^*_\delta \in {}^\mu\theta$ for $\delta \in S$ and f_ε from the list of $\mathscr{F}$ is a function from ${}^\mu\theta$ to θ so $f_\varepsilon(\varrho^*_\delta) < \theta$ hence we can consider the sequence $\bar{c}^\varepsilon = \langle f_\varepsilon(\varrho^*_\delta) : \delta \in$

$S\rangle \in {}^S\theta$ as a candidate for being an $\mathbf{F}$-Md-sequence. If one of them is, we are done. So assume toward contradiction that for each $\varepsilon < \mu$ there is a sequence $\eta_\varepsilon \in {}^\lambda(2^\mu)$ that exemplifies its failure, so there is a $E_\varepsilon \in D$ such that

$\boxtimes_1$ $\delta \in S \cap E_\varepsilon \Rightarrow \mathbf{F}(\eta_\varepsilon \restriction C_\delta) \neq f_\varepsilon(\varrho^*_\delta)$.

Define $\eta^* \in {}^\lambda(2^\mu)$ by $\eta^*(\alpha) = \operatorname{cd}(\langle \eta_\varepsilon(\alpha) : \varepsilon < \mu\rangle)$, now as λ is regular uncountable and the choice of h clearly $E =: \{\delta < \lambda :$ for every $\alpha < \delta$ we have $\eta^*(\alpha) < h(\delta)$ and if $\delta' \in S, \alpha \in C_{\delta'} \cap \delta$ and $C' = C_{\delta'} \cap \alpha$ then $\eta^* \restriction C' \in T_{<\delta}\}$ is a club of λ (see the choice of T and $T_{<\delta}$, and recall as well that by assumption (c) the sequence $\bar{C}$ is good or just weakly good, see Definition 1.5(4) + (4A)).

By clause (a) in the assumption of our claim 1.9, the filter D includes the clubs of λ so clearly $E \in D$; also D is μ^+-complete and every club of λ belongs to it by assumption (a) hence $E^* =: \cap\{E_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu\} \cap E$ belongs to D. Now choose $\delta \in E^* \cap S$, fixed for the rest of the proof; clearly $\eta^* \restriction C_\delta \in \mathscr{P}_\delta$; just check the definitions of $\mathscr{P}_\delta$ and E, E^*. Let $\varepsilon < \mu$. Now recall that $\nu_{\eta^* \restriction C_\delta, \varepsilon}$ is the function from C_δ to $h(\delta)$ defined by

$$\nu_{\eta^* \restriction C_\delta, \varepsilon}(\alpha) = \operatorname{cd}_\varepsilon(\eta^*(\alpha)).$$

But by our choice of η^* clearly $\alpha \in C_\delta \Rightarrow \operatorname{cd}_\varepsilon(\eta^*(\alpha)) = \eta_\varepsilon(\alpha)$, so

$$\alpha \in C_\delta \Rightarrow \nu_{\eta^* \restriction C_\delta, \varepsilon}(\alpha) = \eta_\varepsilon(\alpha) \quad \text{so} \quad \nu_{\eta^* \restriction C_\delta, \varepsilon} = \eta_\varepsilon \restriction C_\delta.$$

Hence $\mathbf{F}(\nu_{\eta^* \restriction C_\delta, \varepsilon}) = \mathbf{F}(\eta_\varepsilon \restriction C_\delta)$, however as $\delta \in E^* \subseteq E_\varepsilon$ clearly $\mathbf{F}(\eta_\varepsilon \restriction C_\delta) \neq f_\varepsilon(\varrho^*_\delta)$ and as $\eta^* \restriction C_\delta \in \mathscr{P}_\delta$ clearly $\rho_{\eta^* \restriction C_\delta} \in {}^\mu\theta$ is well defined. Now easily $\rho_{\eta^* \restriction C_\delta}(\varepsilon) = \mathbf{F}(\nu_{\eta^* \restriction C_\delta, \varepsilon})$ by the definition of $\rho_{\eta^* \restriction C_\delta}$, together $\rho_{\eta^* \restriction C_\delta}(\varepsilon) \neq f_\varepsilon(\varrho^*_\delta)$.

As this holds for every $\varepsilon < \mu$ it follows by the definition of $\operatorname{Sol}_{\rho_{\eta^* \restriction C_\delta}}$ that $\varrho^*_\delta \in \operatorname{Sol}_{\rho_{\eta^* \restriction C_\delta}}$. But $\eta^* \restriction C_\delta \in \mathscr{P}_\delta$ was proved above so $\rho_{\eta^* \restriction C_\delta} \in \{\rho_\eta : \eta \in \mathscr{P}_\delta\}$ hence $\varrho^*_\delta \in \operatorname{Sol}_{\rho_{\eta^* \restriction C_\delta}} \subseteq \cup\{\operatorname{Sol}_{\rho_\nu} : \nu \in \mathscr{P}_\delta\}$ whereas ϱ^*_δ has been chosen outside this set, contradiction. $\square_{1.9}$

1.12 Definition. 1) $\operatorname{Sep}(\chi, \mu, \theta, \theta_1, \Upsilon)$ means that for some $\bar{f}$:

- (a) $\bar{f} = \langle f_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \chi\rangle$
- (b) f_ε is a function from ${}^\mu\theta$ to θ_1
- (c) for every $\varrho \in {}^\chi(\theta_1)$ the set $\{\nu \in {}^\mu\theta$: for every $\varepsilon < \chi$ we have $f_\varepsilon(\nu) \neq \varrho(\varepsilon)\}$ has cardinality $< \Upsilon$.

2) We may omit θ_1 if $\theta = \theta_1$. We write $\operatorname{Sep}(\mu, \theta)$ if for some $\Upsilon = \operatorname{cf}(\Upsilon) \leq 2^\mu$ we have $\operatorname{Sep}(\mu, \mu, \theta, \theta, \Upsilon)$.

There are obvious monotonicity properties:

1.13 Claim. *If* $\mathrm{Sep}(\chi,\mu,\theta,\theta_1,\Upsilon)$ *holds and* $\chi'\geq\chi,\mu'=\mu,\theta'\leq\theta,\theta'_1\leq\theta_1$ *and* $\Upsilon'\geq\Upsilon$, *then* $\mathrm{Sep}(\chi',\mu',\theta',\theta'_1,\Upsilon')$ *holds.*

Proof. Let $\bar f=\langle f_\varepsilon:\varepsilon<\chi\rangle$ exemplify $\mathrm{Sep}(\chi,\mu,\theta,\theta_1,\Upsilon)$. For $\varepsilon<\chi'$ we define $f'_\varepsilon:{}^{(\mu')}(\theta')\to\theta'_1$ by: $f'_\varepsilon(\nu)=f_\varepsilon(\nu)$ if $\varepsilon<\chi$ & $f_\varepsilon(\nu)<\theta'_1$ and $f'_\varepsilon(\nu)=0$ otherwise; note that ${}^{(\mu')}(\theta')\subseteq{}^{\mu}\theta$ hence $f_\varepsilon(\nu)$ is well defined if $\varepsilon<\chi$. Let $\varrho'\in{}^{(\chi')}(\theta'_1)$ and $A'_{\varrho'}=\{\nu\in{}^{(\mu')}(\theta')$: for every $\varepsilon<\chi'$ we have $f'_\varepsilon(\nu)\neq\varrho'(\varepsilon)\}$. Let $\varrho=:\varrho'\restriction\chi$ so $\varrho\in{}^{\chi}(\theta'_1)\subseteq{}^{\chi}(\theta_1)$, hence by the choice of $\langle f_\varepsilon:\varepsilon<\chi\rangle$ the set $A_\varrho=\{\nu\in{}^{\mu}\theta$: for every $\varepsilon<\chi$ we have $f_\varepsilon(\nu)\neq\varrho(\varepsilon)\}$ has cardinality $<\Upsilon$. Recall that $\mu'=\mu$, and assume $\nu\in A'_{\varrho'}$ then $\nu\in{}^{\mu}(\theta')\subseteq{}^{\mu}\theta$, and for $\varepsilon<\chi'$ we have $f'_\varepsilon(\nu)\neq\varrho'(\varepsilon)$ hence for $\varepsilon<\chi(\leq\chi')$ we have $f_\varepsilon(\nu)<\theta'$ & $\varrho(\varepsilon)=\varrho'(\varepsilon)\neq f'_\varepsilon(\nu)=f_\varepsilon(\nu)$ or $f_\varepsilon(\nu)\geq\theta'$ & $\varrho(\varepsilon)=\varrho'(\varepsilon)<\theta'$ & $f_\varepsilon(\nu)\neq\varrho(\varepsilon)$ so $f_\varepsilon(\nu)\neq\varrho(\varepsilon)$. Hence $\nu\in A'_{\varrho'}\Rightarrow\nu\in A_\varrho$ and hence $|A'_{\varrho'}|\leq|A_\varrho|<\Upsilon$ and we are done. $\square_{1.13}$

To show that 1.9 has reasonable assumptions we should still prove 1.10.

Proof of 1.10. Our claim gives sufficient conditions for $\mathrm{Sep}(\mu,\theta)$, i.e. $\mathrm{Sep}(\mu,\mu,\theta,\theta,\Upsilon)$ for some $\Upsilon=\mathrm{cf}(\Upsilon)\leq2^\mu$. Clearly if $\Upsilon<2^\mu$ we can waive "Υ regular" as Υ^+ can serve as well. Let $\chi=\mu$.

Case 1: $\mu=\mu^\theta,\Upsilon=\theta,\theta_0\in[\theta,\mu],\theta_1=\theta$ and we shall prove $\mathrm{Sep}(\mu,\mu,\theta_0,\theta_1,\Upsilon)$. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{F}=\Big\{f:\,&f\text{ is a function with domain }{}^{\mu}(\theta_0)\text{ we have}\\ &\text{for some }u\in[\mu]^\theta\text{ and }\bar\rho=\langle\rho_i:i<\theta\rangle\\ &\text{with no repetition, }\rho_i\in{}^{u}(\theta_0)\text{ we have}\\ &(\forall\nu\in{}^{\mu}(\theta_0)[\rho_i\subseteq\nu\Rightarrow f(\nu)=i]\text{ and}\\ &(\forall\nu\in{}^{\mu}(\theta_0)[(\bigwedge_{i<\theta}\rho_i\not\subseteq\nu)\Rightarrow f(\nu)=0]\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

We write $f=f^*_{u,\bar\rho}$, if $u,\bar\rho$ witness $f\in\mathscr{F}$ as above.

Recalling $\mu=\mu^\theta$, clearly $|\mathscr{F}|=\mu$. Let $\mathscr{F}=\{f_\varepsilon:\varepsilon<\mu\}$ and we let $\bar f=\langle f_\varepsilon:\varepsilon<\mu\rangle$ of course. Clearly clauses (a),(b) of Definition 1.12 holds and let us check clause (c). So suppose $\varrho\in{}^{\mu}\theta$ and let $R=R_\varrho=:\{\nu\in{}^{\mu}(\theta_0)$: for every $\varepsilon<\mu$ we have $f_\varepsilon(\nu)\neq\varrho(\varepsilon)\}$, we have to prove $|R|<\theta$ as $\Upsilon=\theta$.

Towards contradiction, assume that $R\subseteq{}^{\mu}(\theta_0)$ has cardinality $\geq\theta$ choose $R'\subseteq R$

of cardinality θ and so we can find $u \in [\mu]^\theta$ such that $\langle \nu \restriction u : \nu \in R' \rangle$ is without repetitions.

Let $\{\nu_i : i < \theta\}$ list R' without repetitions and let $\rho_i =: \nu_i \restriction u$. Now let $\bar{\rho} = \langle \rho_i : i < \theta \rangle$, so $f^*_{u,\bar{\rho}}$ is well defined and belong to $\mathscr{F}$ hence for some $\zeta < \mu$ we have $f^*_{u,\bar{\rho}} = f_\zeta$. Now for each $i < \theta, \nu_i \in R' \subseteq R$ hence by the definition of $R, (\forall \varepsilon < \mu)(f_\varepsilon(\nu_i) \neq \varrho(\varepsilon))$ in particular for $\varepsilon = \zeta$ we get $f_\zeta(\nu_i) \neq \varrho(\zeta)$. But by the choice of $\zeta, f_\zeta(\nu_i) = f^*_{u,\bar{\rho}}(\nu_i)$ and by the definition of $f^*_{u,\bar{\rho}}$ recalling $\nu_i \restriction u = \rho_i$ we have $f^*_{u,\bar{\rho}}(\nu_i) = i$, so $i = f_\zeta(\nu_i) \neq \varrho(\zeta)$. This holds for every $i < \theta$ whereas $\varrho \in {}^\mu(\theta_1) = {}^\mu\theta$, contradiction.

Case 2: $2^\theta \leq \mu$ and $\mathbf{U}_\theta[\mu] = \mu$ and $\Upsilon = (2^\theta)^+$ or just $(2^{<\theta})^+$ hence $\Upsilon = \operatorname{cf}(\Upsilon) \leq \mu^+ \leq 2^\mu$.
Let $\{u_i : i < \mu\} \subseteq [\mu]^\theta$ exemplify $\mathbf{U}_\theta[\mu] = \mu$. Define $\mathscr{F}$ as in case 1 except that for notational simplicity $\theta_0 = \theta_1 = \theta$ and we restrict ourselves to $u \in \cup\{\mathscr{P}(u_i) : i < \mu\}$. Clearly $|\mathscr{F}| \leq \mu$.

Assume that $R \subseteq {}^\mu\theta$ and $|R| \geq (2^\theta)^+$, hence we can find $\rho^*, \langle (\alpha_\zeta, \rho_\zeta) : i < \theta \rangle$ such that:

$$\rho^*, \rho_\zeta \in R$$

$$\rho_\zeta \restriction \{\alpha_\xi : \xi < \zeta\} = \rho^* \restriction \{\alpha_\xi : \xi < \zeta\}$$

$$\rho_\zeta(\alpha_\zeta) \neq \rho^*(\alpha_\zeta).$$

Clearly $\langle \alpha_\zeta : \zeta < \theta \rangle$ is with no repetitions.

So for some $i < \mu$ the set $u_i \cap \{\alpha_\zeta : \zeta < \theta\}$ has cardinality θ, call it u. So $\{\rho \restriction u : \rho \in R\}$ has cardinality $\geq \theta$ and we can continue as in Case 1. If we like to use $\theta_0 \in [\theta, \mu]$ let pr be a pairing function on μ, without loss of generality each u_i is closed under pr and its inverses, and $f_{u,\bar{\rho}}$ is defined iff for some $\varepsilon < \mu$ we have $u \subseteq u_\varepsilon$ and $i < \theta \Rightarrow \operatorname{Rang}(\rho_i) \subseteq u_\varepsilon$. In the end choose i such that $u_i \cap \{\operatorname{pr}(\alpha_\zeta, \operatorname{pr}(\rho_\zeta(\alpha_\zeta), \rho^*(\alpha_\zeta)) : \zeta < \theta\}$ has cardinality θ.

Case 3: $\mathbf{U}_J[\mu] = \mu$ where $J = [\sigma]^{<\theta}$ and $2^\sigma \leq \mu$ and $\Upsilon = [2^{<\sigma}]^+$.
The proof is similar to Case 2, only find now ρ^* and $\langle (\alpha_\zeta, \rho_\zeta) : \zeta < \sigma \rangle$ and choose $i < \mu$ such that $u_i \cap \{\operatorname{pr}(\alpha_\zeta, \rho_\zeta(\alpha_\zeta)) : \zeta < \sigma\}$ has cardinality θ.

Case 4: $\mu > \theta \neq \operatorname{cf}(\mu)$ and μ is strong limit.

Follows by case 2.

Case 5: $\mu \geq \beth_\omega(\theta)$.

By [Sh 460] we can find regular $\sigma < \beth_\omega(\theta)$ which is $> \theta$ and such that $\mathbf{U}_\sigma[\mu] = \mu$, so Case 3 applies.

Note that in case 2, we can replace $2^\theta \leq \mu$ by: there is $\mathscr{F} \subseteq {}^\theta\theta$ of cardinality $\leq \mu$ such that for every $A \in [\theta]^\theta$ for some $f \in \mathscr{F}$ we have $\theta = \operatorname{Rang}(f \restriction A)$. The proof is obvious. Parallely in case 3. $\square_{1.10}$

There are obvious monotonicity properties.

1.14 Claim. *1) If $(\lambda, \bar{C})$ has the θ-Md-property (see Definition 1.6(1)) and $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ and C^1_δ is an unbounded subset of C_δ for $\delta \in S$ then $(\lambda, \langle C^1_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle)$ has a θ-Md property. We can also increase S and decrease θ.*
2) Assume $\lambda = \operatorname{cf}(\lambda) > \aleph_0, S \subseteq \{\delta : \delta < \lambda, \operatorname{cf}(\delta) = \kappa\}$ is stationary and $\kappa < \chi \leq \lambda$. Then some $\langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ is a (λ, κ, χ)-Md-parameter.
3) Assume $\lambda = cf(\lambda) > \kappa = cf(\kappa), S \subseteq S^\lambda_\kappa$ and

- *(a) $\bar{C}^\ell$ is a λ-Md-parameter for $\ell = 1, 2$*
- *(b) $\bar{C}^1 = \langle C^2_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ has the (Υ, θ)-Md-property*
- *(c) $A_\alpha \in [\alpha]^{<\chi}$ & $\Upsilon^{|A_\alpha|} = \Upsilon$ for $\alpha < \lambda$ and $\delta \in S \Rightarrow C^2_\delta = \cup\{A_\alpha : \alpha \in C^1_\delta\}$.*

Then $\bar{C}^2$ has the (Υ, θ)-Md-property.
4) If $\bar{C}$ is a $(\lambda, \kappa, \chi^+)$-Md-parameter with the (Υ, θ)-Md-property, $\Upsilon^\chi = \Upsilon$ and $C'_\delta = \{\alpha + i : \alpha \in C_\delta \vee \alpha = 0$ and $i < \chi\}$, then $\bar{C}' = \langle C'_\delta : \delta \in \operatorname{Dom}(\bar{C})\rangle$ is a $(\lambda, \kappa, \chi^+)$-Md-parameter with the θ-Md-property.

Proof. 1) Obvious.
2) Easy (note: goodness is not required).
3), 4) Easy by coding (as in the proof of 1.18 below). $\square_{1.14}$

We may consider the following generalization.

1.15 Definition. 1) We say $\bar{C}$ is a λ-MD_1-parameter if:

- *(a)* λ is regular uncountable
- *(b)* S is a stationary subset of λ (all member limit ordinals)
- *(c)* $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta, C_{\delta,\varepsilon} : \delta \in S, \varepsilon < \operatorname{cf}(\delta)\rangle$
- *(d)* $C_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(C_\delta)$
- *(e)* $C_\delta = \bigcup\limits_{\varepsilon < \operatorname{cf}(\delta)} C_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ and $\zeta < \operatorname{cf}(\delta) \Rightarrow \sup(\bigcup\limits_{\varepsilon<\zeta} C_{\delta,\varepsilon}) < \delta$.

2) We say that a λ-MD_1-parameter $\bar{C}$ is good if $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow \lambda > |\{\bigcup_{\varepsilon<\zeta} C_{\delta,\varepsilon} : \delta \in S, \zeta < \mathrm{cf}(\delta) \text{ and } \alpha \geq \sup(\bigcup_{\varepsilon<\zeta} C_{\delta,\varepsilon})\}|$.

3) The (D, Υ, θ)-Md_1-property for $\bar{C}$ means for $\langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$, similarly for the other variants of this property (so the (D, Υ, θ)-MD_1-property for λ for the stationary $S \subseteq S^\lambda_\kappa$ is the same as the (D, Υ, θ)-Md-property).

We may consider the following variant (and claims on it)

1.16 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) λ *be regular uncountable*
- (b) $\mathfrak{B}$ *is a model with universe* λ *such that* $A \in [\lambda]^{<\chi} \Rightarrow c\ell_{\mathfrak{B}}(A) \in [\lambda]^{<\chi}$*; we may allow infinitary functions provided that*
  - $(*)_{\mathscr{B},\kappa}$ *if* $\langle A_i : i < \kappa\rangle$ *is increasing,* $A_i \in [\lambda]^{<\chi}$ *then* $c\ell_{\mathfrak{B}}(\bigcup_{i<\kappa} A_i) = \bigcup_{i<\kappa} c\ell_{\mathfrak{B}}(A_i)$
- (c) $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ *is a good* $(\lambda, \kappa, \kappa^+)$*-MD-parameter*
- (d) $S^* = \{\delta \in S : c\ell_{\mathfrak{B}}(\delta) = \delta\}$
- (e) $C^*_{\delta,\varepsilon} = c\ell_{\mathfrak{B}}(C_\delta \cap \alpha_{\delta,\varepsilon})$ *for* $\delta \in S^*, \alpha \in C_\delta$ *and* $\varepsilon < \kappa$ *where* $\alpha_{\delta,\varepsilon} \in C_\delta$ *is increasing with* ε *with limit* δ*.*

Then $\langle C_\delta, C^*_{\delta,\varepsilon} : \delta \in S^*, \varepsilon < \mathrm{cf}(\delta)\rangle$ *is a good* (S, κ, χ)*-*MD_1*-parameter.*

Proof. Easy.

1.17 Claim. *1) Assume* $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta, C_{\delta,\varepsilon} : \delta \in S, \varepsilon < \mathrm{cf}(\delta)\rangle$ *is a good* (λ, κ, χ)*-*MD_0*-parameter. Then claim 1.9 holds (i.e. we get the* (D, θ)*-*MD_1*-property, of course, we naturally change assumption (e) of 1.9).*
2) In part (1) hence in 1.9, we can weaken clause (e) to

- $(e)'$ *(if* $\lambda = 2^\mu$ *we can use* $h = \mathrm{id}_\lambda$*): there is* $h : \lambda \to 2^\mu$ *increasing continuous with limit* 2^μ *and there is a set* $T = \{\eta_\alpha : \alpha < 2^\mu\}$ *and function* $g : \lambda \to \lambda$ *such that if* $\eta \in {}^\lambda(2^\mu)$ *then for stationary many* $\delta \in S$ *we have*
  - (a) $\eta \restriction C_\delta \in \{\eta_\alpha : \alpha < h(g(\delta))\}$
  - (b) $\zeta < \mathrm{cf}(\delta) \Rightarrow \eta \restriction (\bigcup_{\varepsilon<\zeta} C_{\delta,\varepsilon}) \in \{\eta_\beta : \beta < \delta\}$.

Proof. Same proof as 1.9.

The following claim shows the close affinity of the properties stated in the theorems in the introduction and the θ-Md-property with which we deal here, also it is needed to deduce them from 1.9.

1.18 Claim. *1) Assume $(\lambda, \bar{C})$ has the θ-Md-property where $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ is a (λ, κ, χ)-Md-parameter for D. If $\theta = \theta^{<\chi}$ then $(\lambda, \bar{C})$ has the (χ, θ)-MD_0-property; which means that we can find $\langle f_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ such that:*

- (a) *f_δ is a function from $C'_\delta = C_\delta * \alpha^*_\delta = \{\beta$: for some $\alpha \in C_\delta \cup \{0\}$ we have $\beta \in [\alpha, \alpha + \alpha^*_\delta)\}$ to θ for some $\alpha^*_\delta < \chi$*
- (b) *if f is a function from λ to θ and non zero $\alpha < \chi$ then for stationary many $\delta \in S$ we have $f_\delta \subseteq f$ and $\alpha^*_\delta = \alpha$.*

If we omit χ we mean $\chi = 2$ so $\alpha^*_\delta = 1$ for every $\delta \in S$.
2) Assume in addition that $\bar{C}$ is good$^+$ (λ, κ, χ)-MD-parameter then $(\lambda, \bar{C})$ has the (χ, θ)-MD_2-property which means: if τ is a relational vocabulary of cardinality $< \chi$, then we can find $\langle M_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ such that:

- (a) *M_δ is a τ-model with universe $C'_\delta = C_\delta * \alpha^*_\delta =: \{i$: for some $\alpha \in C_\delta \cup \{0\}$ we have $i \in [\alpha, \alpha + \alpha^*_\delta)\}$ for some $\alpha^*_\delta < \chi$*
- (b) *if M is a τ-model with universe λ and $\alpha < \chi$ then the set $A_{M,\alpha} = \{\delta \in S :$ $M \restriction C_\delta = M_\delta$ and $\alpha^*_\delta = \alpha\}$ is stationary and even belongs to D^+.*

If we omit χ we mean $\chi = 2$ so $\alpha^*_\delta = 1$ for every $\delta \in S$.
3) In part (2) we can allow τ to have function symbols but have:

- $(a)'$ *M_δ is a τ-model with universe $\supseteq C'_\delta = C_\delta * \alpha^*_\delta$ for some $\alpha^*_\delta < \chi$*
- $(b)'$ *if M is a τ-model with universe λ and $\alpha < \lambda$ then the following set belongs to D^+*

$$A'_{M,\alpha} = \{\delta \in S : \alpha^*_\delta = \alpha \text{ and } (M \restriction c\ell_M(C'_\delta), c)_{c \in C'_\delta} \cong (M_\delta, c)_{c \in C'_\delta}\}.$$

4) In part (2) we can replace good$^+$ by good if we add

- $\boxdot$ *each C_δ is closed under pr, where pr is a fixed pairing function on λ.*

Proof. This is a translation (note: "τ is a relational" is a strong restriction).
1) First fix $\alpha^* < \chi$. Let cd be a one-to-one function from $\theta^{<\chi}$ onto θ. Define

$\langle F_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ as follows: if $f \in {}^{(C_\delta)}\theta$ then $F_\delta(f) = \ \mathrm{cd}(\langle f(\beta_{\delta,\varepsilon}) : \varepsilon < \ \mathrm{otp}(C_\delta) \times \alpha^*\rangle$ where $\langle \beta_{\delta,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \ \mathrm{otp}(C_\delta)\rangle$ list $C_\delta * \alpha^*$ in increasing order so F_δ is a function from ${}^{(C_\delta)}\theta$ into θ. Hence for $\bar{F} = \langle F_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ there is a diamond sequence $\langle c_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$. It is easy to compute $\langle f^*_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ as required (with α^*). To have "every $\alpha^* < \chi$" we just have to partition S to $\langle S_\alpha : \alpha < \chi\rangle$ such that each $\bar{C} \restriction S_\alpha$ has the θ-Md-property which follows from 1.20(3) below.
2), 3), 4) Left to the reader. $\square_{1.18}$

1.19 Definition. 1) Let $(\lambda, \bar{C})$ or $\bar{C}$ have the (Υ, θ)-MD$_\ell$-property if $\ell = 0$ and in 1.18(1) we demand $\alpha^*_\delta = 1$ and similar $\ell = 2$ with 1.18(2).
2) Assume $\lambda > \kappa$ are regular and $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ is a (λ, κ, χ)-MD-parameter with the (Υ, θ)-MD-property. Let $\mathrm{ID}_{\lambda,\kappa,\chi,\Upsilon,\theta}(\bar{C}) = \{A \subseteq \lambda : \bar{C} \restriction (S \cap A)$ does not have the (Υ, θ)-MD-property$\}$. If $\Upsilon = \theta$ we may omit it.

1.20 Claim. *Let $\bar{C}, \lambda, \kappa, \chi, \theta$ be as above in Definition and $J = \ ID_{\lambda,\kappa,\chi,\theta}(\bar{C})$.*
1) J is an ideal on λ such that $\lambda \backslash S \in J, \emptyset \notin J$.
2) J is λ-complete and even normal.
3) If $S \subseteq \lambda$ and $S \neq \emptyset$ mod J, <u>then</u> J can be partitioned to θ subsets and $\neq \emptyset$ mod J.

Proof. Straight as the sequence $\langle F_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ is not required to be nicely definable.

* * *

Well, are there good $(\lambda, \kappa, \kappa^+)$-parameters? (on $I[\lambda]$ see [Sh 420, §1]).

1.21 Claim. *1) If S is a stationary subset of the regular cardinal λ and $S \in I[\lambda]$ and $(\forall \delta \in S)[\mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \kappa]$, <u>then</u>*

- *(α) for some club E of λ, there is a good$^+$ $(S \cap E, \kappa, \kappa^+)$-parameter. (Of course, we can replace the κ^+ by $\chi \leq \lambda$)*
- *(β) for some club E of λ there is a weakly good$^+$ $(S \cap E, \kappa, \kappa^+)$-Md-parameter consisting of clubs (this is of interest when $\kappa > \aleph_0$).*

2) If $\kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa), \kappa^+ < \lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$, <u>then</u> there is a stationary $S \in I[\lambda]$ with $(\forall \delta \in S)[\mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \kappa]$.
3) In part (1), moreover, we can find a good $(S \cap E, \kappa, \kappa^+)$-parameter and a λ-complete filter D on λ such that: for every club E' of λ, the set $\{\delta \in S \cap E : C_\delta \subseteq E' \cap E\}$ belongs to D.

Proof. 1) By the definition of $I[\lambda]$ see [Sh 420, §1].
2) By [Sh 420, §1].
3) By [Sh:g, III]. $\square_{1.21}$

1.22 Definition. Let $\bar{C}$ be a (λ,κ,χ)-parameter

(1) For a family $\mathscr{F}$ of $\bar{C}$-colouring and $\mathscr{P} \subseteq {}^{\lambda}2$, let $\mathrm{id}_{\bar{C},\mathscr{F},\mathscr{P}}$ be

$$\Big\{ W \subseteq \lambda : \text{for some } \mathbf{F} \in \mathscr{F} \text{ for every } \bar{c} \in \mathscr{P} \text{ for some } \eta \in {}^{\lambda}\lambda \text{ the set } \{\delta \in W \cap S : \mathbf{F}(\eta \restriction C_\delta) = c_\delta\} \text{ is a non stationary subset of } \lambda \Big\}$$

(2) If $\mathscr{P}$ is the family of all $\bar{C}$-colouring we may omit it. If we write Def instead of $\mathscr{F}$ this mean as in [Sh 576, §1].

We can strengthen 1.5(2) as follows.

1.23 Definition. We say the λ-colouring $\mathbf{F}$ is (S,κ,χ)-good if:

(a) $S \subseteq \{\delta < \lambda : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) < \chi\}$ is stationary
(b) we can find E and $\langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \cap E\rangle$ such that
  (α) E a club of λ
  (β) C_δ is an unbounded subset of $\delta, |C_\delta| < \chi$
  (γ) if $\rho,\rho' \in {}^{\delta}\delta, \delta \in S \cap E$, and $\rho' \restriction C_\delta = \rho \restriction C_\delta$ then $\mathbf{F}(\rho') = \mathbf{F}(\rho)$
  (δ) for every $\alpha < \lambda$ we have $\lambda > |\{C_\delta \cap \alpha : \delta \in S \cap E \text{ and } \alpha \in C_\delta\}|$
  (ϵ) $\delta \in S \Rightarrow |\delta|^{<\mathrm{cf}(\delta)>_{\mathrm{tr}}} < \lambda$ or just $\delta \in S \Rightarrow \lambda > |\{C : C \subseteq \delta$ is unbounded in δ and for every $\alpha \in C$ for some $\gamma \in S$ we have $C \cap \alpha = C_\gamma \cap \alpha|$ and $\alpha \in C_\gamma\}$.

We can sum up

1.24 Conclusion. If $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(2^\mu)$ and we let $\Theta =: \{\theta = \mathrm{cf}(\theta)$ and $(\forall \alpha < 2^\mu)(|\alpha|^{<\theta>_{\mathrm{tr}}} < 2^\mu)\}$ then

(a) Θ is "large" e.g. contains every large enough $\theta \in$ Reg $\cap \beth_\omega$ if $\beth_\omega < \lambda$

(b) if $\theta \in \Theta_\lambda \wedge \theta^+ < \lambda$ then there is a stationary $S \in I[\lambda]$ such that $\delta \in S \Rightarrow \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \theta$

(c) if θ, S are as above then there is a good$^+$ $(\lambda, \kappa, \kappa^+)$-MD-parameter $\langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$

(d) for $\theta, S, \bar{C}$ as above and $\Upsilon \leq 2^\mu$, if $\mathbf{F}$ is a $(\bar{C}, \theta)$-colouring and $D = D_\lambda$ (or D is a μ^+-complete filter on λ extending D_λ, and lastly $S \in D^+$ then there is a middle diamond for $\bar{C}$ and there is an $D - \mathbf{F}$-Wd-sequence; see Definition 1.5(3A).

Proof. Clause (a) holds by [Sh 460], clause (b), (c) holds by 1.21 and clause (d) by the major claim 1.9. $\square_{1.24}$

Note

1.25 Question: 1) Assume λ is a weakly inaccessible (i.e. a limit regular uncountable cardinal but not strong limit) and $\langle 2^\theta : \theta < \lambda\rangle$ is not eventually constant.
Does λ have the weak diamond? Other consequences? In this case $\mathrm{cf}(2^{<\lambda}) = \lambda$ as $\langle 2^\theta : \theta < \lambda\rangle$ witness hence $2^\lambda > 2^{<\lambda} =: \Sigma\{2^\theta : \theta < \lambda\}$. If $\lambda = 2^{<\lambda}$ then $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$, i.e. as in [Sh 755].
2) Consider generalizing [Sh:f, AP,§3] to our present context, i.e. there we have 2 colours; moreover consider $\langle c_\eta : \eta \in \lambda^{+n} \times \lambda^{+(n-3)}\lambda \ldots \times \lambda\rangle$ where $c_\eta \in \theta$.

1.26 Claim. *1) In the proof of 1.9 instead of $f : \lambda \to \theta$ and $f_\delta : C_\delta \to \theta$ we can use $f : [\lambda]^{<\aleph_0} \to \theta$ and $f_\delta : [C_\delta]^{<\aleph_0} \to \theta$ (so get the θ-Md$_\ell$-property for $\ell = 0, 1, 2$).*

Proof. The same.

1.27 Claim. *Assume*

$\circledast_{\mu,\theta}(i)$ $\theta \leq \mu$

(ii) *if $\mathscr{F} \subseteq {}^\mu\theta$ has cardinality $< 2^\mu$ then there is $\rho \in {}^\mu\theta$ such that $(\forall f \in \mathscr{F})(\exists \varepsilon < \mu)(\rho(\varepsilon) = f(\varepsilon))$.*

1) Setp$(\mu, \mu, \theta, 2^\mu)$ hence if 2^μ is a regular cardinal then Sep(μ, θ), that is clause (f) of 1.9.
2) Even if 2^μ is singular still in Claim 1.5 we can replace clause (f) in the assumption by $\circledast_{\mu,\theta}$.

Proof. 1) Clearly ${}^{\mu}\theta$ has cardinality 2^{μ}, so let $\langle \nu^*_\alpha : \alpha < 2^\mu \rangle$ be a list without repetitions of ${}^{\mu}\theta$. For $\alpha \leq 2^\mu$, let $\Gamma_\alpha = \{\nu_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ and we choose $\bar{f}^\alpha$ by induction on $\alpha \leq 2^\mu$ such that

- (a) $\bar{f}^\alpha = \langle f^\alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle$
- (b) f^α_ε is a function from Γ_α to θ
- (c) f^α_ε is increasing continuous in α
- (d) for every $\gamma < \beta < \alpha$ the set $\{\varepsilon < \mu : f^\alpha_\varepsilon(\nu^*_\beta) = \nu_\gamma(\varepsilon)\}$ is not empty.

For clause (d) it is enough to consider the case $\alpha = \beta + 1$, and the non trivial case in the induction is $\alpha = \beta + 1$ and we can choose $\langle f^{\beta+1}_\varepsilon(\nu_\beta) : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle \in {}^{\mu}\theta$ such that it holds by the assumption $(*)$.
2) In the proof of 1.5, now $\rho \in {}^{\mu}\theta \Rightarrow |\mathrm{Sol}_\rho| < 2^\mu$ do not suffice. However, before choosing $\langle f_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle$ we are given $\mathbf{F}$ and we can choose cd, $\langle \mathrm{cd}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle$, define $T, \langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha < 2^\mu \rangle, T_{<\alpha}$ and $\langle \mathscr{P}_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$. Note that $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow |h(\alpha)|^{<\kappa>_{\mathrm{tr}}} < 2^\mu$ hence $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow |\cup\{\mathscr{P}_\delta : \delta \in S \cap \alpha\}| < 2^\mu$. We can also choose $\langle \nu_{\eta,\varepsilon} : \eta \in \mathscr{P}_\delta, \varepsilon < \mu \rangle$ and $\rho_\eta \in {}^{\mu}\theta$ for $\eta \in \mathscr{P}_\delta, \delta \in S$.
Now we can phrase our demands on $\langle f_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle$, it is

- $\boxdot$ ${}^{\mu}\theta \supset \{\nu \in {}^{\mu}\theta$: for some $\eta \in \mathscr{P}_\delta$ we have $(\forall \varepsilon < \mu)(f_\varepsilon(\nu) \neq \rho_\eta(\varepsilon))$.

For this it is enough that for the list $\langle \nu^*_\alpha : \alpha < 2^\mu \rangle$ chosen in the proof of part (1) for each $\delta \in S$, for some $\gamma < 2^\mu$ we have $\{\rho_\eta : \eta \in \mathbf{P}_\delta\} \subseteq \{\nu^*_\alpha : \alpha < \gamma\}$ which is easy. $\square_{1.27}$

§1 Upgrading to larger cardinals[6]

In §1 we get the θ-middle diamond property for regular cardinals λ of the form $\mathrm{cf}(2^\mu)$ on "most" $S \subseteq S^\lambda_\kappa$ for "many" $\kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa)$ (and θ). We would like to prove Theorem 0.1. For this we first give an upgrading, stepping up claim (for MD_ℓ). Then we prove that it applies to λ_2 (for not few λ_1), when λ_2 is successor of regular, then when λ_2 is successor of singular and lastly when λ_2 is weakly inaccessible. We can upgrade each of the variants from §1, but we can concentrate on the one from 1.5(5A) because of Claim 1.18.
The main result is 2.8.

Question: What occurs to λ_2 strongly inaccessible, does it have to have some Md-property?

Possibly combining §1 and §2 we may eliminate the $\lambda_2 > 2^{\lambda_1+\Upsilon+\theta}$ in 2.1, but does not seem urgent now.

2.1 Upgrading Claim. *1) Assume*

- (a) $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ *are regular cardinals such that* $\lambda_2 > 2^{\lambda_1+\Upsilon+\theta}$ *(this last condition can be waived for "nice" colourings)*
- (b) *for some stationary* $S_1 \subseteq S^{\lambda_1}_\kappa$, *some sequence* $\bar{C} = \langle C^1_\delta : \delta \in S_1\rangle$ *is a* $(\lambda_1, \kappa, \chi)$*-Md-parameter which has a* $(D_{\lambda_1}, \Upsilon, \theta)$*-Md-property*
- (c) $\lambda_2 > \lambda_1^+, \lambda_2$ *is a successor of regular.*

Then for some stationary $S_2 \subseteq S^{\lambda_2}_\kappa$, *there is* $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S_2\rangle$, *a good* $(\lambda_2, \kappa, \chi)$*-Md-parameters which has the* $(D_{\lambda_2}, \Upsilon, \theta)$*-Md-property.*
2) We can in part (1) replace clause (c) by any of the following clauses

- $(c)'$ *there is a square on some stationary* $S \subseteq S^{\lambda_2}_{\lambda_1}$, *(holds if* $\lambda_2 = \mu^+, \mu^{\lambda_1} = \mu$*) which means: there are a club* E *of* λ *and* S' *such that* $S \cap E \subseteq S' \subseteq \lambda$ *and* $\bar{C} = \langle C_\alpha : \alpha \in S'\rangle$ *such that:*
  $C_\alpha \subseteq \alpha$,
  α *limit* $\Rightarrow \alpha = \sup(C_\alpha)$
  $\mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha) \leq \lambda_1$,
  $\beta \in C_\alpha \Rightarrow C_\beta = \beta \cap C_\alpha$.
- $(c)''$ λ_2 *has a* (λ_1, S_1)*-square (where* S_1 *is from clause (b)) which means:*
  - $\boxplus^{\lambda_2}_{\lambda_1, S_1}$ $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ *are regular,* $S_1 \subseteq \lambda_1$ *stationary and there are* $S_2 \subseteq S^{\lambda_2}_{\lambda_1}$ *stationary and* $\bar{C}^2 = \langle C^2_\delta : \delta \in S_2\rangle$ *satisfying* $C^2_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(C^2_\delta), C^2_\delta$ *is closed,* $\mathrm{otp}(C^2_\delta) = \lambda_1$ *such that if* $\alpha \in C^2_{\delta_1} \cap C^2_{\delta_2}, \{\delta_1, \delta_2\} \subseteq S_2$ *and* $\alpha = \sup(C^2_{\delta_1} \cap \alpha)$ *and* $\mathrm{otp}(\alpha \cap C^2_{\delta_2}) \in S_1$, *then* $\alpha \cap C^2_{\delta_2} = \alpha \cap C^2_{\delta_1}$.

[6] done March 2001

$(c)'''$ *λ_2 has a $(\lambda_1, \bar{C}_1)$-square $\bar{C}_2$ (where $\bar{C}_1$ is from clause (b)) which means:*

$\boxplus^{\lambda_2}_{\lambda_1,\bar{C}_1,\bar{C}_2}$

- (α) *$\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ are regular uncountable,*
- (β) *$\bar{C}_1 = \langle C^1_\delta : \delta \in S_1\rangle$ is $(\lambda_1, \kappa, \chi)$-Md-parameter*
- (γ) *$\bar{C}_2 = \langle C^2_\delta : \delta \in S_2\rangle$*
- (δ) *$S_2 \subseteq S^{\lambda_2}_{\lambda_1}$ is stationary*
- (ε) *C^2_δ is a closed unbounded subset of δ*
- (ζ) *if $\alpha \in C^2_{\delta_1} \cap C^2_{\delta_2}$ so $\{\delta_1, \delta_2\} \subseteq S_2$ and $\mathrm{otp}\,(\alpha \cap C^2_{\delta_1}) \in S_1$, then $\mathrm{otp}(\alpha \cap C^2_{\delta_1}) = \mathrm{otp}(\alpha \cap C^2_{\delta_2})$, call it γ and $\{\beta \in C^2_{\delta_1} : \mathrm{otp}(\beta \cap C^2_{\delta_1}) \in C^1_\gamma\} = \{\beta \in C^2_{\delta_2} : \mathrm{otp}(\beta \cap C^2_{\delta_2}) \in C^1_\gamma\}$.*

3) Assume $\ell \in \{0, 2\}$

- (a) *$\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ are regular uncountable*
- (b) *for some $(\lambda_1, \kappa, \chi)$-Md-parameter has the θ-MD_ℓ-property*
- (c) *at least one of the variants of clause (c) above holds.*

Then some (λ, κ, χ)-MD_ℓ-parameter has the θ-Md_ℓ-property.

Proof. 1) Clearly if clause (c) holds then clause $(c)'$ of part (2) holds by [Sh 351, §4], so it is enough to prove part (2).
2) Trivially clause $(c)'$ implies clause $(c)''$ and clause $(c)''$ implies clause $(c)'''$; so assume $(c)'''$; and let $\bar{C}^2 = \langle C^2_\delta : \delta \in S_2\rangle$ be as there.

Let $\bar{h} = \langle h_\delta : \delta \in S_2\rangle$ be such that h_δ is an increasing continuous function from λ_1 onto C^2_δ. Let $S = \{h_\delta(i) : \delta \in S_2 \text{ and } i \in S_1\}$ and if $\alpha \in S, \alpha = h_\delta(i), \delta \in S_2$ and $i \in S_1$ then we let $C^*_\alpha = \{h_\delta(j) : j \in C^1_\delta\}$; and let $\bar{C}^* = \langle C^*_\alpha : \alpha \in S\rangle$. Why is C^*_α (hence $\bar{C}^*$) well defined? By clause (ζ) of the assumption $(c)'''$. We should check the conditions for "$\bar{C}$ is a $(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$-Md-property.

The main point is: assume that $\mathbf{F}$ is a $(\bar{C}^*, \Upsilon, \theta)$-colouring, find a $\bar{c}$ as there. For each $\delta \in S_2$ we define a $(\bar{C}^1, \kappa, \theta)$-colouring $\mathbf{F}_\delta$ by $\mathbf{F}_\delta(\eta) = \mathbf{F}(\eta \circ h_\delta)$. As[7] $\lambda_2 > 2^{\lambda_1 + \Upsilon + \theta}$, for some stationary $S^*_2 \subseteq S_2$ we have $\delta \in S^*_2 \Rightarrow \mathbf{F}_\delta = \mathbf{F}_*$, so $\mathbf{F}_*$ is $(\bar{C}^1, \Upsilon, \theta)$-colouring, hence it has a $(D_\lambda, \Upsilon, \theta)$-Md-sequence $\bar{c}^1 = \langle c^1_i : i \in S_1\rangle$. We define $\bar{c}^* = \langle c^*_\alpha : \alpha \in S\rangle$ by $\delta \in S_2 \wedge i \in S_1 \Rightarrow c^*_{h_\delta(i)} = c^1_i$. By clause (ζ) of $(c)'''$ it is well defined. As our colourings deal with $\eta \in {}^{(\lambda_2)}\Upsilon$ only we clearly are done.
3) Similar only easier (or see the proof of 2.9). $\square_{2.1}$

[7] only place this is used, if $\mathbf{F}$ is nicely defined this is not necessary

2.2 Claim. *We can strengthen the conclusion of 2.1(1) and 2.1(2) to: we can find a sequence $\langle S_{2,i} : i < \lambda_2 \rangle$ of pairwise disjoint stationary subsets of λ_2 and for each $i < \lambda_2$ a sequence $\langle C^i_\delta : \delta \in S_{2,i} \rangle$ which is a $(\lambda_2, \kappa, \chi)$-Md-parameter having the $(D_{\lambda_2}, \Upsilon, \theta)$-Md-property.*

Proof. By the proof of 2.1, without loss of generality clause $(c)''$ of 2.1(2) and clauses (a), (b) of 2.1(1) holds. For some $\zeta < \lambda_1$ for unboundedly many $\gamma < \lambda_2$ the set $S_{2,\gamma} =: \{\delta \in S_2 : \gamma \text{ is the } \zeta\text{-th member of } C^2_\delta\}$ is stationary. $\square_{2.2}$

2.3 Conclusion: 1) If μ is a strong limit, λ is a successor cardinal, $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) > 2^\mu$, moreover $\lambda > 2^{2^\mu}$ (superfluous for nice colouring, e.g., for $\mathrm{MD}_\ell, \ell \in \{0, 2\}$), then for every large enough regular $\kappa < \mu$, some good$^+$ $(\lambda, \kappa, \kappa^+)$-Md-parameter $\bar{C}$ has the $(2^\mu, \theta)$-Md-property for every $\theta < \mu$.
2) We can add: $\bar{C}$ has the θ-MD_ℓ-property for $\ell = \{0, 2\}$.
3) We can find a sequence $\langle S_i : i < \lambda \rangle$ of pairwise disjoint stationary subsets of S^λ_κ such that for each $i < \lambda$ there is $\bar{C}^i = \langle C^i_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ as in parts (1) and (2).

Proof. 1) Let $\kappa_0 < \mu$ be large enough such that $\theta \in \{\lambda, 2^\mu\}$ & $\alpha < \theta$ & $\kappa_0 \le \kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) < \mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{[\kappa]} < \theta$, see Definition 1.3, exists by [Sh 460].

By 1.9, for any regular $\kappa \in [\kappa_0, \mu)$ and $\theta < \mu$ we have the result for $\mathrm{cf}(2^\mu)$. If λ is a successor of regular we can apply 2.1(1), i.e. with clause (c) there is a square as required by [Sh 351, §4]. In the case λ is a successor of a singular cardinal, by ? below, clause $(c)''$ of 2.1(2) holds for $\lambda_2 = \lambda, \lambda_1 = \mathrm{cf}(2^\mu)$ so we can apply 2.1.
2) Follows by 1.18.
3) In the proof before applying 2.1 we use 2.2. $\square_{2.3}$

Generalizing [EK]:

2.4 Claim. *1) Assume*

- (a) $\mu = \mathrm{cov}(\mu, \theta^+, \theta^+, \kappa^+)$
- (b) $2^\theta \le \mu$
- (c) $\mu < \lambda \le 2^\mu$

Then there is $\bar{F}$ such that:

- (α) $\bar{F} = \langle F_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle$
- (β) *each F_ε is a function from λ to μ*
- $(\gamma)^-$ *if $u \in [\lambda]^{\le \theta}$ then we can find $\bar{E}$ such that*
  - (i) *$\bar{E} = \langle E_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ is a sequence of equivalence relations on u*

(ii) $\alpha \in u \Rightarrow \{\alpha\} = \cap\{\alpha/E_i : i < \kappa\}$

(iii) *if* $f : u \to \mu$ *respects some* E_i *(i.e.* $\alpha E_i \beta \Rightarrow f(\alpha) = f(\beta)$*) then* $f \subseteq F_\varepsilon$ *for some* $\varepsilon < \mu$.

2) We can strengthen clause $(\gamma)^-$ *to* (γ) *below if* $(d)_\ell$ *for some* $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, 5\}$ *below holds*

(γ) *if* $u \in [\lambda]^{\leq\theta}$ *and* $f : u \to \mu$, *then we can find* $\bar{u} = \langle u_i : i < \kappa\rangle$ *such that*

(i) $u = \cup\{u_i : i < \kappa\}$ *and*

(ii) *for every* $i < \kappa$ *for some* $\varepsilon < \mu$ *we have* $f \restriction u_i \subseteq F_\varepsilon$

$(d)_1$ *there is a sequence* $\bar{f} = \langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ *of pairwise distinct functions from* μ *to* μ *such that: if* $u \in [\lambda]^{\leq\theta}$ *then we can find sequences* $\bar{u} = \langle u_i : i < \kappa\rangle$ *and* $\langle B_i : i < \kappa\rangle$ *such that* $u = \cup\{u_i : i < \kappa\}, B_i \in [\mu]^{<\aleph_0}$ *for* $i < \kappa$ *and for each* $i < \kappa$ *the sequence* $\langle f_\alpha \restriction B_i : \alpha \in u_i\rangle$ *is with no repetitions*

$(d)_2$ *there is a sequence* $\bar{f} = \langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ *of functions from* κ *to* μ *and ideal* J *on* κ *such that* $\bar{f}$ *is* θ^+*-free (i.e. for* $u \in [\lambda]^{\leq\theta}$, *we can find a sequence* $\bar{a} = \langle a_\alpha : \alpha \in u\rangle$ *of subsets of* κ *such that* $a_\alpha = \kappa \bmod J$ *and* $i \in a_\alpha \cap a_\beta$ & $\alpha \neq \beta \Rightarrow f_\alpha(i) \neq f_\beta(i)$*)*

$(d)_3$ *like* $(d)_2$ *but* $a_\alpha \in J^+$ *that is* $a_\alpha \notin J$

$(d)_4$ $(\forall \alpha < \mu)(|\alpha|^\theta < \mu)$ *and* $\lambda < \mathrm{pp}_J(\mu)$ *where* J *is an ideal on* κ

$(d)_5$ $\mu = \mu^{\aleph_0} < \lambda < \mu^\kappa$.

3) Let $\bar{f} = \langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ *be a sequence of pairwise distinct members of* ${}^\mu\mu$. *Then in (1) we can have*

(γ') *if* $u \in [\lambda]^\theta, \langle u_i : i < \kappa\rangle, \langle B_i : i < \kappa\rangle$ *are as in* $(d)_1$ *above, then for any* $f : u \to \lambda$, *we can find a sequence* $\langle u'_i : i < \kappa\rangle$ *of subsets of* u *with union* u *such that* $i < \kappa \Rightarrow f_i \restriction u'_i$ *is included in some* F_ε.

3A) If $\theta = \mathrm{cf}(\theta)$ *and* $(\forall \alpha < \theta)(|\alpha|^\kappa < \theta)$ *then in part (3) clause* $(\gamma)'$ *implies*

(γ'') *if* $u \subseteq \lambda$ *is closed of order type* $\theta + 1$, *then for some club* u^1 *of* $\max(u)$ *letting* $u^2 = \{\delta \in u^1 :$ *if* $\sup(u \cap \delta) = \delta$, *then* $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) > \kappa\}$ *we have:*
for every $f : u^2 \to \mu$ *we can find a club* C *of* θ *and pressing down* g *on* $u^2 \cap C$ *such that* $f \restriction g^{-1}\{i\} \subseteq F_\varepsilon$ *for some* $\varepsilon < \mu$

4) If we weaken the conclusion of part (2), replacing (γ) *by*

$(\gamma)'''_{\theta,\kappa}$ *for every club* E *of* λ *for some closed* $u \subseteq E$ *of order type* θ *there is* $\langle u_i : i < \kappa\rangle$ *such that* $u_i \subseteq u, \zeta \in u$ & $\mathrm{cf}(\zeta) > \kappa \Rightarrow \zeta \in \cup\{u_i : i < \kappa\}$ *and* $(\forall i < \kappa)(\exists \varepsilon < \mu)[f \restriction u_i \subseteq F_\varepsilon)$

<u>then</u> *we can weaken the assumption in a parallel way, e.g.*

$(d)^-_{1,\theta,\kappa}$ *there is* $\bar f = \langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle, f_\alpha \in {}^\mu\mu$ *such that for any club* E *of* λ *we can find a closed* $e \subseteq E$ *of order type* $\theta+1$*, and* $\bar u = \langle u_i : i < \kappa\rangle, \bar B = \langle B_i : i < \kappa\rangle$ *such that* $B_i \in [\mu_1], u_i \subseteq \theta$ *and* $\zeta \in u$ & $\mathrm{cf}(\zeta) \geq \kappa \Rightarrow \zeta \in \cup\{u_i : i < \kappa\}$ *and for each* $i, \langle f_\alpha \restriction B_i : \alpha \in u_i\rangle$ *is with no repetitions (and in* $(d)_3$ *it becomes easy).*

Remark. We can replace λ (as a domain) by $[\lambda]^2$, etc.

Proof. Should be clear. (Identifying the function F with $\{(\alpha, f(\alpha)) : \alpha \in \mathrm{Dom}(f)\}$.)

$\square_{2.4}$

2.5 Claim. *1) Assume*

- (a) $\mu = \mathrm{cov}(\mu, \theta^+, \theta^+, \kappa^+)$
- (b) $2^\theta \leq \mu$
- (c) $\mu < \lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) \leq \mu^\kappa$
- (d) $\theta = \mathrm{cf}(\theta), S \subseteq S^\lambda_\theta$ *is stationary and* $S \in I[\lambda]$
- (e) $T \subseteq \theta$ *and* $\alpha < \lambda$ & $\delta \in T \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{<\mathrm{cf}(\delta)>_{\mathrm{tr}}} < \lambda$.

<u>Then</u> *there is* $\bar F$ *such that*

- (α) $\bar F = \langle F_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu\rangle$
- (β) F_ε *is a function from* λ *to* μ
- (γ) *for a club of* $\delta \in S$*, there is an increasing continuous sequence* $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta\rangle$ *with limit* δ *such that:*
  - $(*)$ *for every function* f *from* $\{\alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \in T\}$ *to* μ *we can find a sequence* $\langle u_i : i < \kappa\rangle$ *of subsets of* T *with union* T *such that* $(\forall i < \kappa)(\exists \varepsilon < \mu)(f \restriction \{\alpha_j : j \in u_i\} \subseteq F_\varepsilon)$.

2) Assume

- (a) $\mu < \lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) \leq 2^\mu$
- (b) $\kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) \leq \theta$
- (c) $\mu = \mu^{<\kappa}$
- (d) $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^\theta \leq \mu$.

Then *there is a sequence* $\langle F_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle$ *of functions from* λ *to* μ *such that*

- $\circledast$ *if* $u \in [\lambda]^{\leq \theta}$ *and* $f : u \to \mu$ *then an increasing sequence* $\langle u_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ *of subsets of* u *with union* u, *for each* $i < \kappa$ *for some* $\varepsilon < \mu, f \restriction u_i \subseteq F_\varepsilon$.

Proof. 1) Let $\bar{M} = \langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ be an increasing continuous sequence of elementary submodels of $(\mathscr{H}(\lambda^+), \in, <^*_\chi)$, each of cardinality $< \lambda$ satisfying $\bar{M} \restriction (\alpha + 1) \in M_{\alpha+1}, \|M_0\| = \mu, M_{1+\alpha} \cap \lambda \in \lambda$ and $\{\lambda, \theta, T, S\} \subseteq M_0$. Let $E = \{\delta < \lambda : M_\delta \cap \lambda = \delta\}$, clearly a club of λ. Let $\bar{a} = \langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ witness $S \in I[\lambda]$ and without loss of generality $\bar{a} \in M_0$.

Now we choose by induction on $\alpha < \lambda$ a function f_α from κ to μ such that:

- $(*)$ if $b \in [\alpha]^{\leq \theta}$ & $b \in M_\alpha + 1$ then $\mathrm{Rang}(f_\alpha) \not\subseteq \cup\{\mathrm{Rang}(f_\beta) : \beta \in b\}$.

Clearly possible.
So for every $i < \kappa$ and $u \in M_0 \cap [\mu]^{\leq \theta}$ and $g : u \to \mu$ from M_0, let $F_{g,i} \in M_0$ be such that $F_{g,i} : \lambda \to \mu$ and it satisfies: if $f_\alpha(i) \in \mathrm{Dom}(g)$ then $F_{g,i}(\alpha) = g(f_\alpha(i))$.

Let $\langle (g_\varepsilon, i_\varepsilon) : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle$ list the set of those pairs (g, i) and let $F_\varepsilon = F_{g_\varepsilon, i_\varepsilon}$. We shall show that $\langle F_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu \rangle$ is as required; so clauses $(\alpha) + (\beta)$ holds trivially.

Now if $\delta \in \mathrm{acc}(E) \cap S$, let $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta \rangle$ list the closure of a_δ in increasing order so for some club C of θ we have $\varepsilon \in C \Rightarrow \alpha_\varepsilon \in E$. Now by assumption (e) clearly $\varepsilon \in C \wedge \mathrm{cf}(\varepsilon) \in \Theta \Rightarrow \langle \alpha_\zeta : \zeta \leq \varepsilon \rangle \in M_{\alpha_\varepsilon + 1}$.
Let

$$u_i = \{\varepsilon \in C : \mathrm{cf}(\varepsilon) \in \Theta \text{ and } f_\alpha(i) \notin \cup\{\mathrm{Rang}(f(\beta)) : \beta \in \{\alpha_\zeta : \zeta < \varepsilon\}\}.$$

Let h be a function from $\{\alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta\}$ to μ. So we can find a sequence $\langle w_j : j < \kappa \rangle$ of subsets of μ of cardinality $\leq \theta$ such that $\mathrm{Rang}(h) \subseteq \bigcup_{j<\kappa} w_j$ and $\{w_j : j < \kappa\} \subseteq M_0$.
Hence for $i, j < \kappa$ there is $g : u_i \cap w_j \to \mu$ which belong to M_0 and satisfies $\varepsilon \in u_i \cap w_j \Rightarrow g(f_{\alpha_\varepsilon}(i)) = h(\alpha_\varepsilon)$, see the choice of u_i. So easily $F_{g,i}$ extends $h \restriction (u_i \cap w_j)$. So $\langle u_i \cap w_j : i, j < \kappa \rangle$ and $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \in E \rangle$ are as required (modulo some renaming).
2) Easy by now and if $\mu = \mu^\kappa$ by [EK], and if not (so $\mathrm{cf}(\mu) = \kappa$) then known.
$\square_{2.5}$

2.6 Claim. *1) Assume*

- (a) $\lambda = \mu^+$ *and* $\kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\mu) < \mu$ *and* $\aleph_0 < \theta = \mathrm{cf}(\theta) < \mu$
- (b) $\Theta = \{\sigma : \sigma = \mathrm{cf}(\sigma) < \mu$ *and* $\mu^{<\sigma>_{\rm tr}} = \mu\}$ *and*
  $T_\theta = \{\delta < \theta : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) \in \Theta\}$,
  $T^+_\theta = T_\theta \cup \{0\} \cup \{\zeta + 1 : \zeta < \theta\}$,
  $T_\theta = T^+_\theta \backslash T_\theta$
- (c) $\mathbf{P} \subseteq \{\bar A : \bar A$ *a sequence of length* $\le \mu$ *subset of* θ *each included in* T^+_θ *and include* $T^-_\theta\}$
- (d) $\mathscr{P} \subseteq [\mu]^\theta$ *has cardinality* $\le \mu$
- (e) *if* $\alpha_\varepsilon < \mu$ *for* $\varepsilon < \theta$ *then for some* $\bar A \in \mathbf{P}$ *we have:* $\zeta < \ell g(\bar A) \Rightarrow \{\alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \in A_\zeta\} \in \mathscr{P}$.

<u>Then</u> *we can find* $(\bar C_i, A_i, S^*_i)$ *for* $i < \mu$ *such that*

- (α) $\{0\} \cup \{\zeta + 1 : \zeta < \theta\} \subseteq A_i \subseteq \theta$
- (β) $\bar C_i = \langle C^i_\delta : \delta \in S_i\rangle; S_i \subseteq \lambda$ *and* $\mathrm{otp}(\alpha \cap C^i_\delta) \in A_i$ & $[\alpha \in C^i_\delta \Rightarrow \alpha \in S_i$ & $C^i_\alpha = \alpha \cap C^i_\delta]$
- (γ) $S^*_i = \{\delta \in S_i : \mathrm{cf}(\theta) = \theta\}$ *is stationary*
- (δ) *for every club* E *of* λ *for some* $\delta^* \in E$ *there is an increasing continuous sequence* $\langle A^*_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa\rangle$ *of subsets of* T^+_θ *including* T^-_θ *such that for each* ε *there is* $\bar A \in \mathbf{P}$ *satisfying:* $(\forall \zeta < \ell g(\bar A))(\exists i < \mu)(\delta^* \in S^*_i$ & $A \supseteq A^*_\varepsilon)$
- (ε) *if* $B \in I[\lambda]$ *and* $B \subseteq S^\lambda_\theta$ *then we can demand* $B \backslash \cup\{S^*_i : i < \mu\}$ *is not stationary and in clause* (δ) *any* $\delta \in B$ *is O.K.*

2) Assume $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^\theta < \mu, T_\theta = \{\delta < \theta : cf(\delta) \ne \kappa\}$ *and we let* $\mathbf{P} = \{\bar A : \bar A = \langle A_i : i < \kappa\rangle$ *is an increasing sequence of sets with union* $T_\theta\}$. <u>Then</u> *for some* $\mathscr{P}$ *all the assumptions hence the conclusion of part (1) holds.*
3) Assume μ_* *is strong limit* $< \mu, \kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\mu) < \mu, \lambda = \mu^+$, <u>then</u> *for some* $\theta_0 < \mu_*$, *for any regular* $\theta \in (\theta_0, \mu_*)$ *the set* T_θ *include* $\{\delta < \theta : cf(\delta) \ge \theta_1$ *or* δ *nonlimit*$\}$ *and for* $\mathbf{P} = \{\bar A : \bar A$ *is a sequence of* $< \theta_0$ *subsets of* θ *with union* T_θ *such that* $\{A_\zeta : \zeta < \ell g(\bar A)\}$ *is closed under finite unions*$\}$.
<u>Then</u> *for some* $\mathscr{P}$ *the assumptions hence the conclusion of part (1) holds.*
4) In (1) (and (2), (3), if $\bar A = \langle A_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \varepsilon(*)\rangle \in \mathbf{P}$ *we can replace it by* $\bar A' = \langle A'_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \varepsilon(*)\rangle, A'_\varepsilon = A_\varepsilon \cup \{\delta < \theta : cf(\delta) > \aleph_0$ *and* $A_\varepsilon \cap \delta$ *is stationary in* $\delta\}$.

2.7 Remark. If λ is (weakly) inaccessible we have weaker results there is $\langle \mathscr{P}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle, \mathscr{P}_\alpha \subseteq [\alpha]^{<\theta}, |\mathscr{P}_\alpha| < \lambda$ such that for every stationarily many $\delta \in S^\lambda_\theta$ for some increasing continuous sequence $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \alpha\rangle$ with limit $\delta, \varepsilon < \theta$ & $\mathrm{cf}(\varepsilon) \in \Theta_\lambda \Rightarrow \{\alpha_\zeta : \zeta < \varepsilon\} \in \mathscr{P}_{\alpha_\varepsilon}$ (see [Sh 420, §1]).

Proof. There is B as in clause (e), that is $B \in I[\lambda]$ and $B \subseteq S^\lambda_\theta$ is a stationary subset of λ, see Claim 1.18. So let B be such a set; clearly omitting from B a nonstationary subset of λ is O.K. (see clause (e)).

We can find $\bar a = \langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ witnessing $B \in I[\lambda]$ so (possibly omitting from B a nonstationary set) we have: $\alpha \in B \Rightarrow \alpha = \sup(a_\alpha)$ & $\theta = \operatorname{otp}(a_\alpha)$ and $[\beta \in a_\alpha \Rightarrow a_\beta = \beta \cap a_\alpha]$ and $[\alpha \in \lambda \backslash B \Rightarrow \operatorname{otp}(a_\alpha) < \theta]$.

Let $\chi = \lambda^+$ and $\bar M = \langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ be an increasing continuous sequence of elementary submodels of $(\mathscr{H}(\chi), a, <^*_\chi)$ to which $\{\bar a, \mu, \mathbf{P}, \mathscr{P}\}$ belongs satisfying $\bar M \restriction (\alpha+1) \in M_{\alpha+1}$ and $\|M_\alpha\| < \lambda$.

For any $\alpha < \lambda$ let $\langle b_{\alpha,\zeta} : \zeta < \mu\rangle$ list $M_{\alpha+1} \cap [\alpha]^{<\theta}$.

Let $\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa\rangle$ be an increasing sequence of regular cardinals with limit μ, $\lambda_\varepsilon > \theta$ with $\lambda = \operatorname{tcf}(\prod\limits_{i<\kappa} \lambda_i, <_{J^{\rm bd}_\kappa})$ and let $\bar f = \langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ be an increasing sequence in $(\prod\limits_{i<\kappa} \lambda_i, <_{J^{\rm bd}_\kappa})$ cofinal in it and obeying $\bar a$ (i.e. $i < \kappa$ & $\beta \in a_\alpha \Rightarrow f_\beta(i) < f_\alpha(i)$ and $\zeta < \lambda_i \wedge i < j < \kappa \wedge \beta \in b_{\alpha,\zeta} \Rightarrow f_\beta(j) < f_\alpha(j)$ (see [Sh:g]).

Now for any $x = (h_1, h_2, A, i) = (h^x_1, h^x_2, A^x, i^x)$ where h_1 is a partial function from μ to θ, h_2 a function from A to μ where $T^-_\theta \subseteq A \subseteq T^+_\theta$ and $i < \kappa$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} S_x = \Big\{ \alpha < \lambda : &\text{we have } f_\alpha(i) \in \operatorname{Dom}(h_1) \text{ and } \zeta =: h_1(f_\alpha(i)) \in A \text{ satisfies} \\ &(i) \quad b_{\alpha,h_2(\zeta)} \text{ is a subset of } \alpha \text{ of order type } \zeta, \\ &(ii) \quad b_{\alpha,h_2(\zeta)} \text{ is unbounded in } \zeta \text{ if } \zeta \text{ is a limit ordinal} \\ &(iii) \quad \text{if } \varepsilon \in A \cap \zeta \text{ and } \beta \in b_{\alpha,h_2(\zeta)} \text{ and } \varepsilon = \operatorname{otp}(b_{\alpha,\zeta} \cap \beta) \\ &\qquad \text{then } \varepsilon = h_1(f_\beta(i)) \ \& \ \beta \cap b_{\alpha,\zeta} = b_{\beta,h_2(\varepsilon)} \Big\} \end{aligned}$$

and for $\alpha \in S_x$ let $C^x_\alpha = b_{\alpha,h_2(h_1(f_\alpha(i)))}$.

Let $\langle X_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \varepsilon^* \le \mu\rangle$ list the set of $x \in M_0$ which are as above and $S^*_x =: \{\delta \in S_x : \operatorname{cf}(\delta) = \theta\}$ is stationary, and let $\bar C_\varepsilon =: \langle C^{x_\varepsilon}_\alpha : \alpha \in S_{x_\varepsilon}\rangle, A_\varepsilon =: A^{x_\varepsilon}$ and $S_\varepsilon =: S_{x_\varepsilon}$.

We have to check the five clauses of 2.6(1):

Clause (α): See the demand on x above.

Clause (β): Holds trivially by the definition "$\alpha \in S_x$" and of C^x_α for $\alpha \in S_x$.

Clause (γ): Holds by the choice of $\langle x_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \varepsilon^*\rangle$.

Clause $(\delta)+(\varepsilon)$: Let $\delta \in B$, so let $\langle \alpha_\zeta : \zeta \le \theta \rangle$ list the closure of a_δ in increasing order.

Now for every $\zeta \in T_\theta^+$, for some $\xi(\zeta) < \mu$ we have $\{\alpha_\xi : \xi < \zeta\} = b_{\alpha,\xi(\zeta)}$ and let $j(\zeta) = \operatorname{Min}\{j < \kappa : \lambda_j > \xi(\zeta)\}$.

For each j let $A_j^* = \{\zeta : \zeta \in T_\theta^-$ or $\zeta \in T_\theta$ & $j(\zeta) < \zeta\}$ and apply clause (e) of the assumption to $\langle \alpha'_\varepsilon =: f_{\alpha_\varepsilon}(j) : \varepsilon \in A_j^* \rangle$ pedantically complete in $\langle \alpha'_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta \rangle \in {}^\theta\mu$, getting $\bar{A}$. The rest should be clear.

2), 3), 4) Left to the reader. $\square_{2.6}$

2.8 Claim. *1) If λ is regular and not strongly inaccessible and $\mu < \lambda$ is strong limit singular of uncountable cofinality, then for every large enough regular $\kappa < \mu$, for every $\Upsilon, \theta < \mu$, some good $(\lambda, \kappa, \kappa^+)$-parameters $\bar{C}$ has the (Υ, θ)-Md-property for $\ell = 0, 1, 2$.*

2) Moreover, we can find such $\bar{C}^\alpha$ for $\alpha < \lambda$ satisfying: $\langle \operatorname{Dom}(\bar{C}^\alpha) : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ are pairwise disjoint.

Proof. 1) Let $\lambda_1 < \lambda$ be such that $\lambda \le 2^{\lambda_1}$ and let $\kappa_0 < \mu$ be large enough such that

$(*)_1(i)$ if λ is not a successor of regular, then $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow \operatorname{cov}(|\alpha|, \mu, \mu, \kappa_0) < \lambda$

(ii) if λ is inaccessible, then $\operatorname{cov}(\lambda_1, \mu, \mu, \kappa_0) = \lambda_1$.

(Exist by [Sh 460].)

Note that λ_1 is needed only if λ is (weakly) inaccessible.

Let $\mu_* \in (\kappa_0, \mu)$ be strong limit; this is possible as μ is strong limit of uncountable cofinality. Let $\kappa_1 = \kappa_1[\mu_*] < \mu_*$ be $> \kappa_0$ and such that $\alpha < 2^{\mu_*} \Rightarrow \operatorname{cov}(|\alpha|, \mu, \mu, \kappa_0) < 2^{\mu_*}$.

Let $\kappa \in \operatorname{Reg} \cap \mu_* \backslash \kappa_1$ and we shall prove the result for κ and every $\Upsilon, \theta < \mu_*$, so without loss of generality $\Upsilon = \theta$. By Fodor's Lemma on μ this is enough.

Let $\lambda_* = \operatorname{cf}(2^{\mu_*})$. By 1.21(1) for every stationary $S \subseteq \{\delta < \lambda_* : \operatorname{cf}(\delta) = \kappa\}$ from $I[\lambda_*]$ (and there are such, see 1.21(2)) there are $\bar{C}^S = \langle C_\delta^S : \delta \in S \rangle, D$ such that $\bar{C}^S$ is a weakly good$^+$ $(\lambda_*, \kappa, \kappa^+)$-Md-parameter, D a λ_*-complete filter on λ_* containing the clubs of λ_* and by 1.9 + 1.10, the pair $(\bar{C}^S, D)$ has the θ-Md-property.

For the case λ is (weakly) inaccessible we add "each C_δ is a club of δ". This is O.K. as we can use clause (β) of 1.21(1). Fix $S_1 \subseteq S_\kappa^{\lambda_*}$ and $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle = \bar{C}^S$.

Note that we actually have

$\boxtimes(a)$ if $S' \subseteq S_1$ is stationary, $C'_\delta \subseteq C_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(C'_\delta)$ for $\delta \in S'$ then $\bar{C}' = \langle C'_\delta : \delta \in S' \rangle$ is a weakly good$^+$ $(\lambda_*, \kappa, \kappa^+)$-Md-parameter and $\bar{C}'$ has the (D, θ)-Md-property

(b) if $\lambda_* = \cup\{A_i : i < i(*) < \kappa\}$ then for some $i, j < i(*), \bar{C}'$ is a good $(\lambda_*, \kappa, \kappa^+)$-Md-parameter and $\bar{C}'$ has the (D, θ)-Md-parameter where $S' =: \{\delta \in S_1 : \delta \in A_j \ \& \ \delta = \sup(C_\delta \cap A_i)\}$ and for $\delta \in S'$ we let $C'_\delta =: C_\delta \cap A_j$ for $\delta \in S'$.
[Why? Let $S'_{i,j} = \{\delta \in S : \delta \in A_j \text{ and } \delta = \sup(C_\delta \cap A_i)\}$. Clearly $\langle S_{i,j} : i, j < i(*)\rangle$ is a partition of S. By Claim 1.20 for some $j < i(*)$ the sequence $\bar{C} \restriction S_{i,j}$ has the (D, θ)-Md-property. By monotonicity, i.e., Claim 1.14(1), the sequence $\langle C_\delta \cap A_i : \delta \in S_{i,j}\rangle$ has the (D, θ)-Md-property.]

Now

Case 1: λ is a successor of regulars.

We apply 2.1(1) with (λ, λ_*) here standing for (λ_2, λ_1) there; there is suitable partial square (in ZFC by [Sh 351, §4]). Note that we do not "lose" any $\kappa < \mu$ because of "the lifting to" λ.

Case 2: λ is a successor of a singular.

The proof is similar only now we use 2.5(3) to get the appropriate partial square using $\boxtimes$ to derive the $\bar{C}'$ used as input for it (recalling each sequence $\bar{A} \in \mathbf{P}$ is closed under union of two!)

Case 3: λ is (weakly) inaccessible.

Really the proof in this case covers the other cases (but λ_1 in this case contributes to increasing κ_0). This time we use 2.5 + 2.9.
Let S_2 be a stationary subset of $S^\lambda_{\lambda_*}$ from $I[\lambda]$ it exists, see 1.21(2). Let $\langle F_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \lambda_1\rangle$ be as in 2.5 only we allow in the range of F_ε also $\{(\zeta, e) : \zeta < \lambda_* \text{ and } e \subseteq \kappa\}$ with $(\lambda, \lambda_1, \lambda_*, \kappa)$ here standing for $(\lambda, \mu, \theta, \kappa)$ there. Possibly replacing S_2 by its intersection with some club of λ, there is a good λ_*-Md-parameter $\bar{C}^2 = \langle C^2_\delta : \delta \in S_2\rangle$. Clearly

(∗) for some $\varepsilon < \lambda_1$ for any club E of λ for some increasing continuous sequence $\langle \alpha_i : i \le \kappa\rangle$ of member of E we have:
$\{i \in S : F_\varepsilon(\alpha_i) = (i, \{(\zeta, \mathrm{otp}(\alpha_\zeta \cap C^2_{\alpha_\varepsilon}) : \alpha_\zeta \in C^2_{\alpha_\xi}\})\}$
is a stationary subset of λ?

For this ε let

(i) $S^*_3 = \{\alpha \in S_2 : F_\varepsilon(\alpha)$ has the right form$\}$

(ii) $C^3_\delta = \{\beta \in C^2_\delta : \mathrm{otp}(\beta \cap C^2_\delta)$ belongs to the second co-ordinate of $F_\varepsilon(\delta)\}$

(iii) $F' : \lambda \to \lambda_*$ is $F'(\alpha) = \zeta$ if:
$F_\varepsilon(\alpha) = \zeta$ or $F_\varepsilon(\alpha) = (\zeta, \mathscr{P})$.

We continue as in 2.9, 2.1.
2) Similarly using Claim 2.2 when using Claim 2.3. $\square_{2.8}$

We now state another version of the upgrading of middle diamonds.

2.9 Claim. *Assume*

(a) $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2$ *are regular cardinals*

(b) $S_1 \subseteq S^{\lambda_1}_\kappa$ *is stationary,* $\bar{C}^1 = \langle C^1_\delta : \delta \in S_1\rangle$ *is a* $(\lambda_1, \kappa, \chi)$*-Md-parameter which has the* $(D_{\lambda_1}, \Upsilon, \theta)$*-MD*$_\ell$*-property,* D_{λ_1} *a filter on* λ_1 *to which* S_1 *belongs where* $\ell \in \{0,1,2\}$

(c) $S_2 \subseteq S^{\lambda_2}_\kappa$ *is stationary and* $\bar{C}^2 = \langle C^2_\delta : \delta \in S_2\rangle$ *is a* (λ, κ, χ)*-Md-parameter*

(d) $F : \lambda_2 \to \lambda_1$ *satisfies: for every club* E *of* λ_2 *there is an increasing continuous function* h *from* λ_1 *into* λ_2 *with* $\sup(\mathrm{Rang}(h)) \in \mathrm{acc}(E)$ *such that* $\{\delta \in S_1 : h(\delta) \in S_2$ *and* $C^2_{h(\delta)} \subseteq \{h(\alpha) : \alpha \in C^1_\delta\}$ *and* $F(h(\delta)) = \delta\}$ *belongs to* D_{λ_1}

(e) *if* $\ell = 1$ *then* $2^{2^{\lambda_1}} < \lambda_2$ *(or the colourings are "nice").*

<u>Then</u> $\bar{C}^2$ *has the* (Υ, θ)*-MD*$_\ell$*-property.*

Remark. 1) Is clause (d) of the assumption reasonable? Later in 4.7 we prove that it holds under reasonable conditions.
2) This + 2.10 are formalized in Definition 4.5.

Proof. Similar to 2.1.

First, assume $\ell = 2$ and let τ be a relational vocabulary of cardinality $< \Upsilon$ and by clause (b) of the assumption there is a sequence $\bar{M}^1 = \langle M^1_\delta : \delta \in S_1\rangle, M^1_\delta$ a τ-model with universe C^1_δ such that

$\circledast_1$ if M is a τ-model with universe λ_1, <u>then</u> the set of $\delta \in S_1$ for which $M^1_\delta = M \restriction C^1_\delta$ is $\neq \emptyset$ mod D_{λ_1}.

Now for every $\delta \in S_2$ if $F(\delta) \in S_1$ and $\{F(\alpha) : \alpha \in C^2_\delta\} \subseteq C^1_{f(\delta)}$ is an unbounded subset of $f(\delta)$, then let M^2_δ be the unique τ-model with universe C^2_δ such that $F \restriction C^2_\delta$ is an isomorphism from M^2_δ onto $M^1_{F(\delta)} \restriction \{F(\alpha) : \alpha \in C^2_\delta\}$. If $\delta \in S_1$ does not satisfy the requirement above let M^2_δ be any τ-model with universe C^2_δ.

Now it is easy to check that $\bar{M}^2 = \langle M^2_\delta : \delta \in S_2\rangle$ is as required.

Second, assume $\ell = 1$ and $\mathbf{F}^2$ be a $(\bar{C}^1, \Upsilon, \theta)$ colouring. For each $(\bar{C}^1, \Upsilon, \theta)$-colouring $\mathbf{F}^1$ we ask:

Question on $\mathbf{F}^1$: Do we have, for every club E an increasing continuous function $h : \lambda_1 \to \lambda_2$ such that

- (i) $\sup(\mathrm{Rang}(h)) \in E$
- (ii) the following set is a stationary subset of λ_1
  $\delta \in S_1 : h(\delta) \in S_2$ and $C^2_{h(\delta)} \subseteq \{h(\delta) : \alpha \in C^1_\delta\}$ and $F(h(\delta)) = \delta$ and $(\forall \eta_1 \in {}^{(C^1_\delta)}\Upsilon)(\forall \eta_2 \in {}^{(C^2_{h(\delta)})}\Upsilon)[(\forall \alpha \in C^1_\delta)(\eta_1(\alpha) = \eta_2(h(\alpha))) \Rightarrow \mathbf{F}^1(\eta_1) = \mathbf{F}^2(\eta_2)]$.

If for some $\mathbf{F}^1$ the answer is yes, we proceed as in the proof for $\ell = 1$. Otherwise, for each such $\mathbf{F}^1$ there is a club $E[\mathbf{F}^1]$ exemplifying the negative answer. Let $E = \cap\{E[\mathbf{F}^1] : \mathbf{F}^1$ is a $(\bar{C}^1, \Upsilon, \theta)$-colouring$\}$. As there are $\leq 2^{2^{\lambda_1}}$ such $\mathbf{F}^1, E$ is a club of λ_2 and using (d) of the assumption, there is $h : \lambda_1 \to \lambda_2$ as there. Now we can define $\mathbf{F}^1$ by $h, \mathbf{F}^2$ naturally and get a contradiction.
The case $\ell = 0$ is left to the reader. $\square_{2.9}$

Trying to apply 2.9, clause (d) of the assumption look the more serious. By the following if each C^1_δ are stationary subsets of δ (so $\kappa > \aleph_0$), it helps.

2.10 Claim. *Is 2.9, if $2^{\lambda_1} < \lambda_2$, and we can replace (d) by $(d)^- + (f)$ below, then we can conclude that for some $\bar{C}^3 = \langle C^3_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ has the θ-MD_ℓ-property where $C^3_\delta \in D_\delta$*

- (f) *$\bar{D} = \langle D'_\delta : \delta \in S_2\rangle, D'_\delta$ is a filter on C^2_δ containing the co-bounded subsets of C^2_δ (or just $D_\delta \subseteq \mathscr{P}(C^2_\delta)\backslash\{A \subseteq C^2_\delta : \sup(A) < \delta\}$*
- $(d)^-$ *$F : \lambda_2 > \lambda_1$ satisfies: for every club E of λ for some increasing continuous function h from λ_1 to λ_2 with $\sup(\mathrm{Rang}(h)) \in \mathrm{acc}(E)$ the set $\{\delta \in S_1 : h(\delta) \in S_2$ and $\{h(\alpha) : \alpha \in C^1_\alpha\} \cap C^2_\delta \in D'_\delta\}$ belong to D_{λ_1}.*

Proof. Let $\mathscr{C} = \{\bar{e} : \bar{e} = \langle e_\delta : \delta \in S_1\rangle, e_\delta$ is a subset of $C^2_\delta\}$.

So $|\mathscr{C}| \leq 2^{\lambda_1} < \lambda$ and for each $\bar{e} \in E$ we define $\bar{C}^{\bar{e}} = \langle C^{\bar{e}}_\delta : \delta \in S^{\bar{e}}_2\rangle$ by $S^{\bar{e}}_\delta = \{\delta \in S_2 : C^{\bar{e}}_\delta \in D_\delta\}$ where $C^{\bar{e}}_\delta = \{\alpha \in C^2_\delta : \mathrm{otp}(C^2_\delta \cap \alpha) \in e_{F(\delta)}\}$. If for some $\bar{e} \in \mathscr{C}, \bar{C}^{\bar{e}}$ is as required. $\square_{2.10}$

§3 Catching more cofinalities[8]

It is clear that in the Major Claim 1.9 a reasonable hope is to weaken the assumption of "$\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{<\kappa>_{tr}} < \lambda$". We look here at sufficient conditions for what is really needed in 1.9, i.e., the 2^μ-few branches property. The pcf assumptions here are not stated in an optimal but just shortest way.

4.1 Definition. Let $\lambda > \theta > \aleph_0$ be regular.
1) We say that $\bar{C}$ is a $(\lambda, < \theta)$-pseudo square if

- (a) $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$
- (b) S is a stationary subset of λ
- (c) C_α is an unbounded subset of α,
- (d) $\mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha) < \theta$
- (e) the set $S^2_\theta[\bar{C}] = \{\delta < \lambda : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \theta$ and there is a stationary subset W of δ such that $W \subseteq S$ and $\zeta \in W \Rightarrow W \cap \zeta \subseteq C_\zeta\}$ is stationary.

2) We say that $\bar{C}$ is a $(\lambda, < \theta, \kappa)$-pseudo square if in addition

- (f) if $\delta \in S$ then $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \kappa$.

3) We add "closed" if each C_δ is required to be closed.
4) We replace the pseudo by partial if for $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in S$ we have $\delta_1 \in C_{\delta_2} \Rightarrow C_{\delta_1} = C_{\delta_2} \cap \delta_1$.
5) We replace pseudo by pseudo^0 if instead $S^2_\theta[\bar{C}]$ we use $S^0_\theta[\bar{C}]$ where

$$\begin{aligned} S^0_\theta[\bar{C}] =: \{\delta < \lambda :& \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \theta \text{ and for some increasing} \\ & \text{continuous sequence } \langle \alpha_{\delta,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \theta \rangle \\ & \text{with limit } \delta, \text{the set } \{\zeta < \theta : \alpha_{\delta,\zeta} \in S \text{ and} \\ & \zeta = \sup\{\alpha_{\delta,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \delta \text{ and } \alpha_{\delta,\varepsilon} \in C_\delta\} \\ & \text{is a stationary subset of } \theta\} \end{aligned}$$

Let pseudo^1 mean pseudo.

[8] 2002/4/23

4.2 Claim. *Assume*

(a) $\lambda > \theta > \kappa$ *are regular cardinals*
(b) $2^{<\theta} < \lambda$
(c) $\bar{C}$ *is a* (λ, θ)*-psuedo*^{0}*-square*
(d) $\mathscr{C} = \{C_\alpha \cap \beta : \beta \in C_\alpha \text{ and } \alpha \in S\}$
(e) *if* $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathrm{Reg} \cap [\theta^+, \lambda)$ *has cardinality* θ *then* $\mathrm{pcf}_{\theta\text{-complete}}(\mathfrak{a}) \subseteq \lambda$.

Then $\bar{C}$ *has the weakly* λ*-few-branches-property, see below.*
2) If (a) - (d) and $(e)_\mu$ *below, then* $\bar{C}$ *has the weakly* μ*-few-branches property where*

$(e)_\mu$ $\mathrm{cf}(\mu) = \lambda$ *and if* $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathrm{Reg} \cap \mu \backslash \theta^+$ *has cardinality* $< \theta$ *then* $\mathrm{pcf}_{\theta\text{-complete}}(\mathfrak{a}) \subseteq \lambda$.

We shall prove it below but first:

4.3 Definition. Assume $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle, S \subseteq \lambda$ stationary, $C_\delta \subseteq \delta = \sup(C_\delta)$.
1) Let $\mathscr{C}[\bar{C}] = \{C_\alpha \cap \beta : \alpha \in S, \beta \in C_\alpha\}$.
2) $T[\bar{C}] = \{\eta : \eta \in {}^{\mathscr{C}}X \text{ for some } C \in \mathscr{C}[\bar{C}]$.
3) We say that $\bar{C}$ has λ-few-branches properties if some $\bar{\mathscr{F}}$ witness it which means that

(α) $\bar{\mathscr{F}} = \langle \bar{\mathscr{F}}_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$
(β) $\mathscr{F}_\delta$ is a family of functions from C_δ to δ which has cardinality $< \lambda$
(γ) if $\eta \in {}^\lambda\lambda$ then the set $\{\delta \in S : \eta \restriction C_\delta \in \mathscr{F}_\delta\}$ is stationary.

4) We say that $\bar{C}$ has the μ-few branches property if some pair $(h, \bar{\mathscr{F}})$ witness it which means

(α) $h : \lambda \to \mu$ is increasing continuous with unbounded range
(β) $\bar{\mathscr{F}} = \langle \mathscr{F}_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ and $\mathscr{F}_\delta \subseteq {}^{(C_\delta)}h(\delta)$
(γ) if $\eta \in {}^\lambda\mu$ then the set $\{\delta \in S : \eta \restriction C_\delta \in \mathscr{F}_\delta\}$ is stationary.

5) We say that $\bar{C}$ has the h-few-branches property if h is an increasing continuous function from λ into some $\mu = \sup(\mathrm{Rang}(h))$ and some $\bar{\mathscr{F}}$ witness it which means that $(\beta), (\gamma)$ above holds.
6) $\mathscr{C}_{wk}[\bar{C}] = \{A : A \text{ is a bounded subset of some } C_\delta\}$.
7) $T_{wk}[\bar{C}] = \{\eta : \eta \in {}^C\lambda \text{ for some } C \in \mathscr{C}_{wk}[\bar{C}]\}$.
8) In (3), (4) we add weak which means that in (γ) we replace $\eta \restriction C_\delta$ by $\eta \restriction C'$ for some unbounded $C' \subseteq C_\delta$.

4.4 Observation. 1) If $\bar{C}$ has the (λ,κ,χ)-Md-parameter and it has the weak μ-few branches property and $2^{<\chi}<\mu$ then there is $\bar{C}'$ such that:

- (α) $\bar{C}'$ is $(\lambda,\kappa,\kappa^+)$-Md-parameter
- (β) $\bar{C}'=\langle C'_\delta:\delta\in S\rangle$ where $\bar{C}=\langle C_\delta:\delta\in S\rangle$ and $C'_\delta\subseteq C_\delta$
- (γ) $\bar{C}'$ has the μ-few-branches property.

2) If $\bar{C}=\langle C_\delta:\delta\in S\rangle$ is a (λ,κ,χ)-Md-parameter with the [weak] μ-few branches property, then for some $\gamma<\chi,\bar{C}\restriction S^{[\gamma]}$ has the [weak] μ-few-branches property where $S^{[\gamma]}=\{\delta\in S:\mathrm{otp}(C_\delta)=\delta\}$.

Proof. First we fix $\langle\mathrm{otp}(C_\delta):\delta\in S\rangle$ using a pairing function, trying all possibilities. Second we fix the subset. $\square_{4.4}$

Proof of 4.3. Straight by pcf theory. $\square_{4.3}$

On WNR see [DjSh 562], [CDSh 571], [DjSh 691]. This is the case (λ,κ,κ) below?

4.5 Definition. 1) We say (λ,θ,κ) has NPr (and write $\mathrm{NPr}(\lambda,\theta,\kappa)$ if:

- (a) $\lambda>\theta\geq\kappa=\ \mathrm{cf}(\kappa)>\aleph_0$
- (b) there is $h:\lambda\to\theta$ such that for every $\delta<\lambda$ of cofinality κ for some club C of κ the function $h\restriction C$ is one-to-one.

2) Let $\mathrm{Pr}(\lambda,\theta,\kappa)$ be the negation of $\mathrm{WNRef}(\lambda,\theta,\kappa)$.
3) For D a filter on κ extending the club filter on κ or just a subset of $\mathscr{P}(\kappa)$ satisfying: if $A,B\subseteq\kappa,A\Delta B$ is not stationary then $(A_1\in D)\equiv(A_2\in D)$. We say that $(\lambda,\theta,\kappa,D)$ has weak nonreflection (also written $\mathrm{WNRef}(\lambda,\theta,\kappa,D)$ if:

- (a) $\lambda>\theta\geq\kappa=\ \mathrm{cf}(\kappa)>\aleph_0$
- (b) there is $h:\lambda\to\theta$ such that if $\langle\alpha_\varepsilon:\varepsilon\leq\kappa\rangle$ is increasing continuous and $i<\theta$ then $\{\varepsilon<\kappa:h(\alpha_\varepsilon)=i\}$ does not belong to D.

Let $\mathrm{Pr}(\lambda,\theta,\kappa,D)$ be the negation. We always assume $A,B\subseteq\kappa\wedge E\subseteq\kappa$ a club $A\cap E=B\cap E\Rightarrow(A\in D\equiv B\in D)$.
4) Assume that $\mathbf{D}$ is an index-family of filters, $\mathscr{E}$ a filter on the index set $\mathrm{Dom}(\mathbf{D})$ or on $\mathbf{D}$.
5) Let $\mathrm{Dom}(\mathbf{D})=\cup\{\mathrm{Dom}(D):D\in\mathbf{D}\}$.
6) We say $\mathbf{D}$ is $(\mathscr{E},\theta)$-dense if for every function f with domain $\mathrm{supp}(\mathscr{D})$ and range of cardinality $<\theta$ we have

$$\{D \in \mathbf{D} : f \text{ is contant on some } A \in D\} \neq \emptyset \bmod E$$

7) We say $\mathbf{D}$ is $(\mathscr{E}, \theta)$-positive if for every function f from $\mathrm{supp}(\mathbf{D})$ to some bounded subset of θ, $\{D : f \text{ is constant on some } A \in D^+\} \neq \emptyset \bmod D$.

4.6 Observation. 1) Assume $\mathrm{NPr}(\lambda, \theta, \kappa, D)$ and λ is regular $h : \lambda \to \theta$ and C_δ is a club of δ of order type κ for $\delta \in S^\lambda_\kappa$ then the set $R_h = \{\delta < \lambda : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \kappa$ and $\{\mathrm{otp}(\alpha \cap C_\delta) : \alpha \in C_\delta$ and $h(\alpha) = i\}$ belong to D for some $i < \theta\}$ is stationary.

Proof. If $h : \lambda \to \theta$ and E is a club of λ disjoint to the set R_h then let $h' : \lambda \to \theta$ be defined by $h'(\alpha) = g(g(\alpha))$ where $g : \lambda \to E$ is increasing continuous. So if R_h is not stationary E is a club disjoint to it we get that h' witness $\mathrm{WNRef}(\lambda, \theta, \kappa)$.

4.7 Claim. *1) Assume*

- (a) $\mathrm{WRef}(\mu_*, \theta, \kappa)$
- (b) $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) > \mu_*$
- (c) $2^\kappa < \lambda$
- (d) $S \subseteq S^\lambda_\kappa$ *is stationary*
- (e) *if* $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathrm{Reg} \cap \lambda \backslash \mu^+_*$ *has cardinality* $\leq \mu_*$ *then* $\mathrm{pcf}_{\theta^+\text{-complete}}(\mathfrak{a}) \subseteq \lambda$.

Then for some $\bar{C}$

- (α) $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$
- (β) C_δ *is a stationary subset of* δ
- (γ) *if* $S \in I[\lambda]$ *then* $\bar{C}$ *is good*
- (δ) $\bar{C}$ *has* λ*-few branches property.*

2) Assume (a)-(d) and

- $(e)_\mu$ $\mathrm{cf}(\mu) = \lambda$ *and if* $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathrm{Reg} \cap \mu \backslash \mu^+_*$ *has cardinality* $\leq \mu_*$ *then* $\mathrm{pcf}_{\theta^+\text{-complete}}(\mathfrak{a} \leq \lambda$.

Then for some $\bar{C}$, $(\alpha), (\beta), (\gamma)$ *and* (δ) $\bar{C}$ *has* μ*-few branches property.*

Proof. Left to the reader.

4.8 Claim. *1) In 1.9 we can replace assumption (x) to*

$(x)'$ $\bar{C}$ *has the* 2^μ*-few-branches property.*

2) Moreover, we have the squared middle diamond [here? see §6].

Proof. The same.

For proving 4.8, for omitting in 1.9 the assumption $S \in I[\lambda]$ which we use to find a weakly good (λ,κ,χ)-Md-parameter but strengthen $|\delta|^{<\mathrm{cf}(\delta)>_{tr}} < \lambda$ to $|\delta|^{<\mathrm{cf}(\delta)>} < \lambda$ hence for proving the results in the end of the next section where $\lambda \in I[\lambda]$ is used and using the squared middle diamond the following helps.

4.9 Existence Claim.

(a) $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(2^\mu)$, D *is a* μ^+*-complete filter extending the club filter*

(b) $\chi < \lambda$ *and* $S \subseteq S_{<\chi}$ *is stationary*

$(c)(i)$ $\bar{\mathscr{A}} = \langle \mathscr{A}_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$

(ii) $\mathscr{A}_\delta = \langle A^\delta_j : j < j^*_\delta\rangle$, $j^*_\delta \le \mu$ *and* $|A^\delta_j| < \chi$, $A^\delta_j \subseteq \delta = \sup(A^\delta_j)$

(iii) $\mathscr{P}_\delta$ *has cardinality* $\subseteq \mu$

(d) $2^{<\chi} \le 2^\mu$ *and* $\theta \le \mu$

$(e)(i)$ $\gamma^* \le \chi$

(ii) $A^* \subseteq \gamma^*$ $\{\delta < \gamma^* : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \kappa\}$

(iii) $\bar{\mathscr{P}} = \langle \mathscr{P}_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$, $\mathscr{P}_\delta \subseteq [\delta]^{<\chi}$ *and* $|P_\delta| < 2^\mu$

(iv) *for every* $E \in D$ *and* $\eta \in {}^\lambda(2^\mu)$ *there is an increasing continuous sequence* $\langle \delta_\gamma : \gamma \le \gamma^*\rangle$ *of members of* E *and* $j < j^*$ *such that*

- (α) *if* $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2$ *are from* A^* *then* $A^{\delta_{\gamma_1}}_j = A^{\delta_{\gamma_2}}_j \cap \delta_{\gamma_1}$
  [so we can fix $\langle \mathrm{otp}[A^{\delta_\gamma}_j] : \gamma \in A^*\rangle \in A^*_\chi$*!]*
- (β) $\gamma \in A^* \Rightarrow \eta \restriction A^{\delta_\gamma}_j \in \mathscr{P}_\delta \wedge \delta_\gamma \in S$

(f) $Sep(\mu,\theta)$ *and* $\mu^{|\gamma^*|} = \mu$.

Then *we can find* $j < \mu$ *such that: if* $\bar{F}$ *is a* $(\bar{C}, 2^\mu, \theta)$*-colouring then for some* $\langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle \in {}^S\theta$ *we have:*

for any $\eta \in {}^\lambda(2^\mu)$ *and club* E *of* λ *for some increasing continuous sequence* $\langle S_\gamma : \gamma \le \gamma^*\rangle$ *of members of* E *we have:*

(α) $\gamma \in A^* \to \delta_\gamma \in S$ & $\mathscr{F}(\eta \restriction A^{\delta_\gamma}_j) = C_\gamma$

(β) *if* $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2$ *are from* A *then* $A^{\delta_{\gamma_1}}_j = A^{\delta_{\gamma_2}}_j \cap \delta_{\gamma_1}$.

We can now conclude

4.10 Conclusion: 1) If $\lambda = 2^\mu$ and $\mu_* < \mu$ is strong limit, then for any $\theta < \mu_*$ and uncountable regular $\kappa < \mu_*$, some $(\lambda, \kappa, \kappa^+)$-Md-parameter $\bar{C}$ has the θ-Md-property provided that (a) or (b) holds

- (a) 2^μ is successor of regulars
- (b) for every regular uncountable $\kappa < \mu_*$ and $\lambda_* < \mu_*$ there are $\theta < \lambda' < \mu_*$ such that $\Pr(\lambda', \theta, \kappa)$ and $\lambda' > \lambda_*$
- (c) if $\aleph_0 < \kappa = \text{ cf}(\kappa) < \mu_*, \tau < \mu_*$ is large enough, $\mathfrak{a}_i \subseteq \text{ Reg } \cap 2^\mu \backslash \mu_*$ is finite for $i < \tau$, then for stationarily many $\delta \in S^\tau_\kappa$ for some stationary $A \subseteq \delta$ we have $\max \text{pcf}(\cup\{\mathfrak{a}_i : i \in A\}) < 2^\mu$.

Discussion: 1) We can weaken the pcf demand.

2) If we have the $(\beth_\omega, \aleph_\omega)$-property for each λ for some $n(*) < m(*)$ are large enough, $\langle \mathfrak{a} : i < \beth^+_{m(*)} \rangle$ is a sequence of finite $\mathfrak{a}_i \subseteq [\beth_\omega, \lambda) \cap \text{ Reg}$ then for some stationary $S \subseteq S^{\beth^+_{m(*)}}_{\aleph_{n(*)+1}}$, for each $\delta \in S$ for some stationary $S' \subseteq \delta$, $\max \text{pcf} \cup\{\mathfrak{a}_i : i \in S'\} < \lambda$.

3) Use: $\lambda > \mu, \mu$ strong limit $\aleph_0 < \kappa = \text{ cf}(\kappa) < \mu$ and for some $\theta \in \text{ Reg } \cap \mu \backslash \kappa^+$, the pair (Q, κ) fails the strong nonreflection.

We may change Definitions 1.5, 1.6 by the following.

We certainly gained though no real difference in the theorems in §0.

4.11 Definition. 1) We say that $\mathbf{F}$ is a $(\bar{C}, \Upsilon, \theta)_*$-colouring if:

- (a) $\bar{C}$ is a λ-Md-parameter
- (b) $\mathbf{F}$ is a function from $\{f$: for some $\alpha < \lambda, f$ is a function from $([\alpha]^{<\aleph_0})_\Upsilon$ to θ
- (c) if $\delta \in S$ and $\eta_0, \eta_1 \in {}^\delta\Upsilon$ and $\eta_0 \restriction [C_\delta]^{<\aleph_0} = \eta_1 \restriction [C_\delta]^{<\aleph_0}$ then $\mathbf{F}(\eta_0) = \mathscr{F}(\eta_1)$.

2) If $\Upsilon = 2$ we may omit it.

3) We may replace $\mathbf{F}$ by $\bar{F} = \langle F_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$ where F_δ is a function from $\{f : f$ a function from $[C_\delta]^{<\aleph_0}$ to $\Upsilon\}$ to θ.

Abusing our notation, we do not strictly distinguish $\mathbf{F}$ and F:

4) Assume $\mathbf{F}$ is a $(\bar{C}, \Upsilon, \theta)$-colouring, where $\bar{C}$ is a λ-Md-parameter.

We say $\bar{c} \in {}^S\Upsilon$ (or $\bar{c} \in {}^\lambda\Upsilon$) is an $\mathbf{F}$-middle diamond sequence, or an $\mathbf{F}$-Md-sequence if:

- $(*)$ for every $\eta \in {}^\lambda\Upsilon$, the set $\{\delta \in S : \mathbf{F}(\eta \restriction \delta) = c_\delta\}$ is a stationary subset of λ.

We also may say $\bar{c}$ is an $(\mathbf{F}, S)$-Md-sequence or any $(\mathbf{F}, \bar{C})$-Md-sequence.
5) We say $\bar{c} \in {}^{S}\Upsilon$ is a $D - \mathbf{F}$-Md-sequence if D is a filter on λ to which S belongs and

(*) for every $\eta \in {}^{\lambda}\Upsilon$ we have

$$\{\delta \in S : \mathbf{F}(\eta \restriction \delta) = c_\delta\} \neq \emptyset \bmod D.$$

6) We say $\bar{C}$ has the (D, θ)-Md-property if

(a) $\bar{C}$ is a λ-Md-parameter
(b) D a filter on λ
(c) if $\mathbf{F}$ is a $(\bar{C}, \theta)$-colouring, then there is a $D - \mathbf{F}$-Md-sequence, see part (3A).

7) We say that $\bar{C}$ has the (D, Υ, θ)-Md-property as in (5A) only $\mathbf{F}$ is a $(\bar{C}, \Upsilon, \theta)$-colouring. We may omit D if D is the club filter. We may omit θ if $\theta = 2$.
8) We say $S \subseteq \lambda$ has the θ-Md-property mean that some $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ has.
Now we shall note that not much is changed.

* * *

We note below a dichotomy for a regular cardinal θ.

4.12 Claim. *Assume*

$\circledast_{\theta,\mu}$ $\kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) < \mu, \mu$ *is strong limit and* $\kappa = \lambda_0 < \lambda_n < \lambda_{n+1} < \mu = \Sigma\{\lambda_n : n < \omega\}, \lambda_n$ *regular,* $\theta \in [\kappa, \mu)$ *and for* $n \in (0, \omega)$ *there is* $\bar{C}^n, \bar{a} = a(\lambda, \kappa)$*-Md-parameter* $\bar{C}^n = \langle C^n_\delta : \delta \in S^\lambda_\kappa\rangle$ *such that* $(\forall f \in (\lambda_{n+1})(\lambda_n)(\exists^{\mathrm{stat}}\delta \in S^{\lambda_n+1}_\kappa)[f \restriction A$ *is constant on some unbounded* $C' \subseteq C_\delta.]$

1) If $\lambda > \mu$, *then for some* n_λ *for every* $n \in (n_\lambda, \omega)$

(*) *if* $\theta_\alpha \in$ *Reg* $\cap \lambda \backslash \mu$ *for* $\alpha < \lambda_{n+1}$ *then for some* $f : \lambda_{n+1} \to \lambda_n$, *if* $\delta \in S, A \subseteq C_\delta = \delta = \sup(A)$ *and* $f \restriction A$ *is constant then* $\max \mathrm{pcf}\{\theta_\alpha : \alpha \in A\} \leq \lambda$.

2) Assume $\circledast_{\theta,\mu}$ *which is as defined in (1) only* C_δ *is a club of* δ *and* $A \in C_\delta$ *is stationary, so, of course,* $\kappa > \aleph_0$ *(i.e.* $NPr(\lambda, \lambda_{n+1}, \lambda_n, \theta)$*). If* $\lambda = 2^{2^{\mu_*}}$ *then* S^λ_κ *has the* (Υ, θ)*-Md-property for* $\Upsilon, \theta < \mu$.
3) In 1.9 assume instead (e),

$(e)'$ $NPr(\lambda, \kappa_*, \kappa), \kappa < \beth_\omega \cap$ *Reg* $, \kappa_* < \beth_\omega$ *regular large enough such that* $\alpha < 2^\mu \Rightarrow \mathrm{cov}(|\alpha|, \kappa^+_*, \kappa^+_*, \kappa_*)$.

Proof. 1) We use [Sh 513, §1], i.e. we should define $\mathfrak{D}_n$.
2) Follows (note that the choice of $\bar{C}$ is immaterial and having a counterexample to λ gives one for λ').

4.13 Claim. *Assume* $\kappa = \mathrm{cf}/(\kappa) > \aleph_0$ *and* $\neg(\forall\theta > \kappa)(\exists\lambda \in \mathrm{Reg}\backslash\theta)(\mathrm{NPr}(\lambda,\theta,\kappa)$. *For some* θ^* *for every* $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) > \theta$ *for some* $h : \lambda \to \theta^*$, *if* $\delta \in S^\lambda_\kappa$ *then* h *is one to one on some club of* δ.

4.14 Claim. *Assume* $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ *is a* (λ,κ)*-Md-parameter,* $S \subseteq \lambda = \mathrm{cf}(2^\mu), S \subseteq S^\lambda_\kappa$ *is stationary and* $\mathrm{otp}(C_\delta) = \kappa > \aleph_0$, *for* $\delta \in S$ *and the condition (a)-(d),(f) of 1.9 holds. Let* $h_\delta = \mathrm{OP}_{\kappa,C_\delta}$.

Let $\langle f^\delta_\alpha : i < \lambda\rangle$ *list* ${}^\kappa(2^\mu)$ *and assume that the conclusion of 1.9 fails. Then for any* $\nu \in {}^\lambda(2^\mu)$ *for some* $\eta \in {}^\lambda(2^\mu)$ *and club* E *of* λ *we have: if* $\delta \in S \cap E$ *then* $\eta \circ h_\theta \notin \{f^\delta_\alpha : \alpha < \nu(\delta)\}$; *moreover,* $i < \nu(\delta) \Rightarrow \eta \circ h_\delta \neq_{J^{bd}_\kappa} f^\delta_i$.

§4 Further upgrading

We try get somewhat better results concerning upgrading and strongly inaccessibles. In fact we show

4.1 Conclusion. 1) Let $\mu > \aleph_0$ be strong limit. For some $\kappa_0 < \mu$ for every regular not strongly inaccessible $\lambda \geq 2^{2^\mu}$, for every $\kappa \in \text{ Reg } \cap \mu \backslash \kappa_0^+$ except possibly one, S^λ_κ has the (Υ, θ)-Md-property (moreover, we can partition it to λ sets each with that property).
2) If $\lambda = \text{ cf}(\lambda)$ is not strong limit and $2^\mu < y$ then for some $\kappa_* = \text{ cf}(\kappa_*) \leq \mu$ we have: if $\lambda_* \leq \mu$ is regular, uncountable $\bar{C}$ is a $(\lambda_*, \kappa, \kappa^+)$-Md-parameter consisting of clubs, $\kappa = \text{ cf}(\kappa) \neq \kappa_*$ and $\bar{C}$ having the (Υ, θ)-Md-property and $S \subseteq S^\lambda_\kappa$ is stationary, $\in I[\lambda]$, then for some S has the (Υ, θ)-Md-property (witnessed by a sequence of clubs).

Proof. Let $\lambda_* = \text{ cf}(2^\mu)$ and let $\kappa_0 < \mu$ be regular such that $\kappa \in \text{ Reg } \cap \mu \backslash \kappa_0 \wedge \alpha < \lambda_* \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{<\kappa>_{\rm tr}} < \lambda_*$ and let $\Upsilon, \theta < \mu$. Now let $\kappa \in \text{ Reg } \cap \mu \backslash \kappa_0^+$, so there is a stationary $S^\kappa_1 \subseteq S^{\lambda_*}_\kappa$ which belong to $I[\lambda]$ and let $\bar{a} = \langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ be such that $a_\alpha \subseteq \alpha$, $\text{otp}(a_\alpha) \leq \kappa, \alpha \in S^\kappa_1 \Leftrightarrow \alpha = \sup(a_\alpha), \beta \in a_\alpha \Rightarrow a_\beta = a_\alpha \cap \beta$. For $\delta \in S^\kappa_1$, let $C^{1,\kappa}_\delta = \{\gamma : \gamma < \alpha \text{ is a limit ordinal of cofinality (exactly) } \kappa_0 \text{ and } \gamma = \sup(a_\alpha \cap \gamma)\}, D_1 =$ the club filter on $\kappa + \{\delta < \kappa : \text{cf}(\delta) = \text{ cf}(\kappa_0)\}$.

Now $\langle C^{1,\kappa}_\delta : \delta \in S^\kappa_1 \rangle$ is a good $(\lambda_1, \kappa, \kappa^+)$-Md-parameter. So by 1.17 it has the (Υ, θ)-MD-property. Let $\lambda_2 = \text{ cf}(\lambda_2) > 2^{\lambda_1}$, so it is enough to show $(\bar{C}^{1,\kappa}_\delta, D_\kappa)$ is liftable to λ_2 so by 2.9 + 2.10, the parallel to μ there is chosen below, so we have to check the conditions, mainly clause $(d)^-$ of 2.10.

Let $\chi = \text{ Min}\{\chi : 2^\chi \geq \lambda_3\}$.

Case 1: χ is strong limit, $\text{cf}(\chi) < \mu$ in χ. The one exceptional cofinality is $\text{cf}(\chi)$ and when $\kappa \neq \text{ cf}(\chi)$ and the parallel to μ in 2.10, the hypothesis $(d)'$ of 2.10 holds by 2.5(2), i.e., at least one of them.

Case 2: χ strong limit, $\text{cf}(\chi) \geq \mu$.

So $\chi = \chi^\mu < \lambda \leq 2^\chi$, so we again use χ (and 2.5(2)).

Case 3: χ not strong limit.

So we can find $\sigma < \chi$ such that $2^\sigma \geq \chi$ so $2^\sigma < \lambda$ by the choice of χ hence $\sigma < \chi \leq 2^\sigma < \lambda < 2^\chi \leq 2^{2^\sigma}$ and $(2^\sigma)^\sigma = 2^\sigma$ hence $(2^\sigma)^\mu = 2^\sigma$, so we are done as in Case 2? using 2^σ.
2) Similarly. $\square_{4.1}$

Remark. So if $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) > 2^\mu$ then for some $\kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) \leq \mu$ and χ the triple (λ, χ, κ) satisfies the demands hence the conclusion of 2.5(2) for (λ, μ, κ), in fact, χ is not strong limit or $\chi^\mu = \chi$.

Below we shed some light also being able to "lift", in particular for the strongly inaccessible case.

4.2 Definition. 1) For regular uncountable $\kappa < \lambda$ and normal filter D on κ let $I^*_1[\lambda, \kappa, D]$ be the family of $A \subseteq \lambda$ such that:

> for some club E of λ for every increasing continuous sequence $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa \rangle$ of ordinals from E we have $\{\varepsilon < \kappa : \alpha_\varepsilon \in A\} = \emptyset \bmod D$.

2) For $\ell \in \{2, 3\}$ and λ regular uncountable, $I^*_\ell[\lambda]$ is the family of $A \subseteq \lambda$ such that some E and $\bar{\mathscr{P}} = \langle \mathscr{P}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ witness it which means:

$\circledast_{A, \bar{\mathscr{P}}}$ (i) E is a club of λ

(ii) $\mathscr{P}_\alpha \subseteq \mathscr{P}(\alpha)$

(iii) $|\mathscr{P}_\alpha| < \lambda$ and if $\ell = 3, |\mathscr{P}_\alpha| \leq |\alpha|$

(iv) for every singular $\delta \in A \cap E$ we have: δ is a limit ordinal and there is an increasing continuous sequence $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mathrm{cf}(\delta) \rangle$ with limit δ such that

$$\boxtimes \qquad \varepsilon < \mathrm{cf}(\delta) \Rightarrow \{\alpha_\zeta : \zeta < \varepsilon\} \in \mathscr{P}_{\alpha_\varepsilon}.$$

3) $I^*_\ell[\lambda, \kappa, D]$ is defined as in part (2) but in clause (iv) is

$(iv)'$ for every $\delta \in A \cap E \cap S^\lambda_\kappa \backslash (\kappa + 1)$ there is an increasing continuous sequence $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa \rangle$ with limit δ such that $\{\varepsilon < \kappa : \{\alpha_\zeta : \zeta < \varepsilon\} \in \mathscr{P}_{\alpha_\varepsilon}\} \in D$.

4.3 Observation. : Let λ be regular uncountable.
1) $I^*_\ell[\lambda]$ for $\ell = 2, 3$ is a normal idea on λ.
2) $I^*_3[\lambda] \subseteq I^*_2[\lambda]$.
3) If λ is a successor cardinal, then $I_2[\lambda] = I_3[\lambda]$.
4) If $\kappa \in \mathrm{Reg} \cap \lambda \backslash \aleph_1$ and D is a filter on κ, then $I^*_\ell[\lambda, \kappa, D]$ is a normal filter on λ for $\ell = 2, 3$ and $I^*_3[\lambda, \kappa, D] \subseteq I^*_2[\lambda, \kappa, D]$.

* * *

The following claim 4.7 helps us to show, e.g.,

4.4 Conclusion. If $\mu_1 < \mu_2$ are strong limit singular, $\mathrm{cf}(\mu_2) \neq \mu_1^+, \kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) < \mu_1^+, S^{\mu_1^+}_\kappa \notin I[\mu_1^+]$, so necessarily $\mathrm{cf}(\mu_1) < \kappa$, then some (in fact quite many) $S \subseteq S^{\mu_2^+}_\kappa$ has middle diamond if some $S^{\mu_1^+}_\kappa$ has (where it holds in many cases).

Proof. By 4.7 below and 2.9 + 2.10.

In detail we apply claim 4.7 for $\lambda = \mu_2^+, \theta = \mu_1^+, \kappa$ as above, $D = \{A \subseteq \mu_1^+ : S^{\mu_1^+}_\kappa \backslash A \in I[\mu_1^+]\}$ or any normal filter.

By [Sh 108] there is $S^*_\ell \subseteq \mu_\ell^+$, (the "bad" set) such that $I[\mu_\ell^+] = \{A \subseteq \mu_\ell^+ : A \backslash S^*_\ell$ not stationary$\}$. Let $S_2 = S^{\mu_2^+}_{\mu_1^+} \backslash S^*_2$. Clearly the assumptions (a) - (e) of 4.7(1) hold (clause (d) because μ_2 is strong limit and $\mu_1^+ \neq \mathrm{cf}(\mu_2)$).

Letting $S_1 = S^{\mu_2^+}_\kappa \backslash S^*_2$ by [Sh 108] clause (f) of 4.7 hence all its assumptions hold. As clause (A) of 4.7 of its conclusion fail, necessarily clause (B) of 4.7 holds. Let $\lambda_1 = \mu_1^+, \lambda_2 = \mu_2^+, D_{\lambda_1} = D$.

By 2.9 + 2.10 we get the desired conclusion and we are done provided that its assumption holds. Now (a), (b), (c), (e) are easy. For clause (a) and also clause (f) using D'_8 being a copy of D. We are left with clause $(d)^-$, which holds as (B) of 4.7 holds. $\square_{2.10}$

4.5 Definition. 1) Let $\bar{C} = \langle C^1_\delta : \delta \in S_1\rangle$ be a $(\lambda_1, \kappa, \chi)$-Md-parameter, $\bar{D} = \langle D_\delta : \delta \in S_1\rangle, D_\delta$ a filter on C^1_δ and D^* is a filter on λ_1. We say $(\bar{C}, \bar{D}, D^*)$ is liftable to λ_2 if:

- (a) $\lambda_2 = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda_2) > \lambda_1$
- (b) there are $F : \lambda_2 \to \lambda_1$ and $\bar{C}^2 = \langle C^2_\delta : \delta \in S_2\rangle$, a $(\lambda_2, \kappa, \chi)$-parameter such that clause $(\mathrm{d})^-$ of 2.10 above holds.

2) Instead $\bar{D}$ we may write one D^1 if $\langle \mathrm{otp}(C^1_\delta) : \delta \in S_1\rangle$ is constant and $D_\delta \cong D^1$ for $\delta \in S_1$. Instead $\bar{C}$ we may write $S \subseteq \lambda_1$ meaning every $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S_1\rangle, C_\delta$ is a clug of δ of order type $\mathrm{cf}(\delta)$.

4.6 Discussion: Of course, if we like to guess not $M \restriction C^2_\delta$ but $M \restriction B$ for some $B \in D_\delta$, then $(\mathrm{d})^-$ suffice.

4.7 Claim. *Assume*

(a) $\lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) > 2^\theta$

(b) $\theta = \mathrm{cf}(\theta) > \kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\kappa) > \aleph_0$

(c) D *a normal filter on* θ *such that* $S^\theta_\kappa \in D$

(d) $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow \mathbf{U}_{D+a}(\alpha) < \lambda$ *for every* $a \in D^+$ *(e.g.* $|\alpha|^{[\theta]} < \lambda$*)*

(e) $S_2 \subseteq S^\lambda_\theta$

(f) $S_1 \subseteq S^\lambda_\kappa, S_1 \in I[\lambda]$ *such that: for every club* E *of* λ *for some increasing continuous sequence* $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta \rangle$ *of members of* E *we have* $\sup\{\alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta\} \in S_2$ *and* $\{\varepsilon < \theta : \alpha_\varepsilon \in S_1\} \in D$.

Then *at least one of the following occurs*

(A) *some* $B \in D$ *belongs to* $I[\theta]$ *(so if* D *is* $D_\theta + S^\theta_\kappa$*, then* $S^\theta_\kappa \in I[\theta]$*)*

(B) *there are* $A \in D^+$ *and* $F : \lambda \to \theta$ *such that for every club* E *of* λ*, for some increasing continuous sequence* $\bar\alpha = \langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta \rangle$ *of members of* E *we have* $\cup\{\alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta\} \in S_2$ *and* $[\varepsilon \in A \Rightarrow \alpha_\varepsilon \in A \ \&\ F(\alpha_\varepsilon) = \varepsilon]$.

Proof. Let $\langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ witness $S_1 \in I[\lambda]$, so $a_\alpha \subseteq \alpha, [\beta \in a_\alpha \Rightarrow a_\beta = a_\alpha \cap \beta]$, $\mathrm{otp}(a_\alpha) \le \kappa, \alpha \in S_1 \Leftrightarrow \alpha = \sup(a_\alpha)$ (possibly replacing S_1 by $S_1 \cap E$ for some club E of λ).

For each $\delta \in S_2$ we choose $\bar\alpha_\delta = \langle \alpha_{\delta,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \theta \rangle$ increasing continuous with limit δ. Possibly shrinking S_2, without loss of generality $\delta \in S_2 \Rightarrow \{\varepsilon : \alpha_{\delta,\varepsilon} \in S_1\} \in D$. Let $b_\delta = \{\varepsilon < \theta : \alpha_{\delta,\varepsilon} \in S_1$ hence $\mathrm{cf}(\varepsilon) = \kappa$ and[9] $a_{\alpha_{\delta,\varepsilon}} \not\subseteq \cup\{a_{\alpha_{\delta,\zeta}} : \zeta < \varepsilon \ \&\ \alpha_{\delta,\zeta} \in S_1\}\}$. Let $S_2^- = \{\delta \in S_1 : b_\delta \neq \emptyset \bmod D\}$.

Case 1: S_2^- is a stationary subset of λ.

For each $\delta \in S_2^-$ for every $\varepsilon \in b_\delta$ clearly we have $\alpha_{\delta,\varepsilon} \in S_1$ hence $\alpha_{\delta,\varepsilon} = \sup(a_{\alpha_{\delta,\varepsilon}})$ and by the last phrase in the definition of b_δ there is $\xi_{\delta,\varepsilon} < \varepsilon$ such that

$\circledast$ $a_{\alpha_{\delta,\varepsilon}} \cap \alpha_{\xi_{\delta,\varepsilon}} \not\subseteq \cup\{a_{\alpha_{\delta,\zeta}} : \zeta < \varepsilon \ \&\ \alpha_{\delta,\zeta} \in S_1\}$.

As D is normal (or just weakly normal), for some $\xi_\delta < \theta$

$\circledast_0$ $b^-_\delta =: \{\varepsilon \in b_\delta : \xi_{\delta,\varepsilon} \le \xi_\delta\} \neq \emptyset \bmod D$.

[9] if we demand "$a_{\alpha_{\delta,\varepsilon}} \setminus \cup\{a_{\alpha_{\delta,\zeta}} : \zeta < \varepsilon \ \&\ \alpha_{\delta,\zeta} \in S_1\}$ is unbounded in $\alpha_{\delta,\varepsilon}$" the proof does not change.

As S_2^- is stationary and $2^\theta < \lambda$, for some stationary $S_3^- \subseteq S_2^-$ and pair (b^*, α^*) we have

$\circledast_1$ $\delta \in S_3^- \Rightarrow b_\delta^- = b^*$ & $\alpha_{\delta,\xi_\delta} = \alpha^*$.

Let $\mathscr{P} \subseteq [\alpha^*]^\theta$ exemplify $\mathbf{U}_{D+b^*}(|\alpha^*|) < \lambda$, that is,

$\circledast_2$ $|\mathscr{P}| = \mathbf{U}_D(|\alpha^*|)$ and for every $f : \theta \to \alpha^*$ for some $a \in (D+b^*)^+$ and $u \in \mathscr{P}$ we have $\mathrm{Rang}(f \restriction a) \subseteq u$.

As $2^\theta < \lambda$, using a pairing function clearly there is $\mathscr{F}$ such that

$\circledast_3$ $\mathscr{F} \subseteq \{f : f \text{ a partial function from } \theta \text{ to } \alpha^*\}$ of cardinality $\leq 2^\theta + U_{D+b^*}(\alpha^*)$ such that for every $f : \theta \to \alpha^*$ for some $a \in (D+b^*)^+$ we have $f \restriction a \in \mathscr{F}$.

For each $\delta \in S_3^-$ we define a function $f_\delta : b^* \to \alpha^*$ by $f_\delta(\varepsilon) = \mathrm{Min}(a_{\alpha_{\delta,\varepsilon}} \cap \alpha^* \setminus \cup \{a_{\alpha_{\delta,\zeta}} : \zeta < \varepsilon \ \& \ \zeta \in b^*\})$, it is well defined as $b^* = b_\delta^-$ because $\delta \in S_2^-$. Clearly

$\circledast_4$ f_δ is one to one.

We define $g_\delta : b^* \to \kappa$ by $g_\delta(\varepsilon) = \mathrm{otp}(a_{\alpha_{\delta,\varepsilon}} \cap f_\delta(\varepsilon))$ so for some $i_\delta < \kappa, b_\delta^2 = \{\varepsilon \in b^* : g(\varepsilon) = i\} \in D^+$. Now for each $\delta \in S_3^-$ by the choice of $\mathscr{F}$ there is $b_\delta^3 \subseteq b_\delta^2, b_\delta^3 \neq \emptyset \bmod D$ such that $f_\delta \restriction b_\delta^3 \in \mathscr{F}$. As $|\mathscr{F}| = \mathbf{U}_{D+b^*}(|\alpha^*|) + 2^\theta < \lambda$, for some stationary $S_4^- \subseteq S_3^-$ and $(b^{**}, i(*), f^*)$ we have

$\circledast_5$ $b^{**} \subseteq b^*, b^{**} \in D^+, f^* \in \mathscr{F}$ and $\delta \in S_4^- \Rightarrow b_\delta^2 = b^{**}$ & $i_\delta = i(*)$ & $f_\delta \restriction b^{**} = f^*$.

By $\circledast_4$ we have

$\circledast_6$ f^* is a one to one function from b^{**} into α^*.

Now let $F : S_1 \to \theta$ be such that $F(\alpha) = \varepsilon$ if $f^*(\varepsilon)$ is equal to the $i(*)$-th member of a_α. It exemplifies clause (B), one of the two possible conclusions of 4.7.

Case 2: $S_2 \setminus S_2^-$ stationary[10].

So we can choose $\delta \in S_2 \setminus S_2^-$ so $b_\delta = \emptyset \bmod D$. We choose by induction on $\varepsilon < \theta$ a pair $(h_\varepsilon, \gamma_\xi)$ such that:

- (a) $\gamma_\varepsilon < \theta$
- (b) h_ε is a one-to-one function from $\cup\{a_{\alpha_{\delta,\zeta}} : \zeta < \varepsilon \ \& \ \zeta \in S_1\}$ onto the ordinal γ_ε

[10] but recall that we have shrink S_2 in the beginning of the proof

(c) γ_ε is increasing continuous with ε

(d) $\zeta < \varepsilon \Rightarrow h_\zeta \subseteq h_\varepsilon$

(e) if $\alpha \in a_\beta$ and $\beta \in \ \mathrm{Dom}(h_\varepsilon)$ then $\alpha \in \ \mathrm{Dom}(h_\varepsilon)$ and $h_\varepsilon(\alpha) < h_\varepsilon(\beta)$.

There is no problem to carry the induction.
Let $h = \cup\{h_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta\}$.
Let $E = \{\varepsilon < \theta : \gamma_\varepsilon = \varepsilon\}$, this is a club of θ. Let $A = A_\delta = \{\varepsilon : \varepsilon \in E \backslash b_\delta$ and $\alpha_\varepsilon \in S_1\}$, so $A_\delta \in D$.

For $\varepsilon \in A_\delta$ we define $C^1_\varepsilon = C^1_{\delta,\varepsilon} = \{h(\beta) : \beta \in a_{\alpha_{\delta,\varepsilon}}\}$. On θ we define a two-place relation $<^*$:

$$<^*_\delta = \{(h_\varepsilon(\beta_1), h_\varepsilon(\beta_2)) : \beta_1 \in a_{\beta_2} \text{ so necessarily } \beta_2 \in S_\theta\}.$$

So $(\theta, <^*_0)$ is a tree with κ levels, and $\alpha <^* \beta \Rightarrow \alpha < \beta$ (see clause (e)) and $\langle C^1_{\delta,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \in A\rangle$ is as required in clause (A) of 4.7 so we are done. $\square_{4.7}$

4.8 Remark. 1) Note that we can apply 4.7 varying D. We certainly can replace it by $D + A$, hence we can strengthen (B) of the conclusion to:

$(B)^+$ for every $B \in D^+$ has a subset $A \in D^+$ and $F : \lambda \to \theta$ as in clause (B).

2) If clause (d) of the assumption of 4.7 holds for every normal filter D' extending D, then for some $E \in D$ and regressive $h : E \to \theta$, each $A = h^{-1}\{\alpha\}$ is as required in clause (B).
3) Instead of clause (c) of the assumption of 4.7 we can assume

$(c)^-$ D is a weakly normal filter on θ containing all the clubs of θ such that $S^\theta_\kappa \in D$.

4) We can also use D not a filter, just what is used on D^+.
5) We can in 4.7 fix $\bar{a}$ and claim that (A) holds if Case 2 applies, possibility (B) holds if Case 1 applies.

4.9 Conclusion. Assume that

(a) λ is strongly inaccessible

(b) $\lambda > \mu = \ \mathrm{cf}(\mu)$

(c) D is a normal filter on μ such that $D^+ \cap I[\mu] = \emptyset$

(d) $\bar{C}$ is a $(\theta, \kappa, \kappa^+)$-Md-parameter with the (Υ, θ) consisting of clubs $\kappa > \aleph_0$.

Then S^λ_θ has the (Υ, θ)-property (using some sequence of clubs).

Proof. As $S^\lambda_\kappa \in I[\kappa]$.

§5 Relative of $I[\lambda]$

5.1 Definition. 1) Assume that $\kappa < \lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$ and $A \subseteq \kappa$ we say that λ weakly accept (κ, A) if there is $\bar{\mathscr{P}} = \langle \mathscr{P}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ witnessing it which means

- (a) $\mathscr{P}_\alpha \subseteq [\alpha]^{<\kappa}$
- (b) $|\mathscr{P}_\alpha| < \lambda$
- (c) for every club E of λ there is an increasing continuous function h from κ to λ (we can make into ? by gl) such that
  - $(*)$ if $\zeta \in A$ and $\zeta = \sup(A \cap \delta)$ then $h(\zeta) \in E$ & $\{h(\varepsilon) : \varepsilon \le \zeta\} \in \mathscr{P}_{h(\zeta)}$.

2) Assume $\kappa < \lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$ and D is a filter on κ. We say that λ weakly accepts (κ, D) if there is $\bar{\mathscr{P}} = \langle \mathscr{P}_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ witnessing it which means:

- (a) $\mathscr{P}_\alpha \subseteq [\alpha]^{<\kappa}$
- (b) $|\mathscr{P}_\alpha| < \lambda$
- (c) for every club E of λ there are $A \in D$ an increasing continuous function h from κ to λ such that $(*)$ holds.

3) Replacing D by $\mathscr{P}' \subseteq \mathscr{P}(\kappa)$ has the same meaning and if $\emptyset \in \mathscr{P}' \subseteq \mathscr{P}(\kappa)$ we mean $\mathscr{P}(\kappa) \backslash \mathscr{P}'$.
4) We say "strongly accept" if in the witness $\bar{\mathscr{P}}$, each $\mathscr{P}_\alpha$ is a singleton.
5) We say "accept " if in the witness $\bar{\mathscr{P}}$ we have $|\mathscr{P}_\alpha| \le |\alpha|$ (may say medium accept).

5.2 Definition. Let λ be regular uncountable.
1) Let $I'[\lambda] = I'_{md}[\lambda]$ or $I'_{st}[\lambda]$ or $I'_{wk}[\lambda]$ be the family of $S \subseteq \lambda$ with a witness $\bar{\mathscr{P}}$ which means $\bar{\mathscr{P}} = \langle \mathscr{P}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$, $\mathscr{P}_\alpha \subseteq \mathscr{P}(\alpha)$ has cardinality $< \lambda$ or has cardinality ≤ 1 or has cardinality $\le |\alpha|$ such that: for some club E of λ

- $\boxdot$ for every $\delta \in E \cap S$ there is a closed unbounded $C \subseteq \delta$ of order type $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) < \delta$ such that
  - $(*)$ $\alpha \in C \cup \{\delta\} \Rightarrow C \cap \alpha \in \mathscr{P}_\alpha$.

2) Assume $\lambda > \delta(*)$ and $\mathrm{cf}(\delta(*)) = \kappa$. For $x \in \{md, st, wk\}$ we define $I'_x[\lambda, \delta(*), \kappa]$ similarly only

- $(*)$ if $\delta \in E \cap S$ and $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \kappa$ then there is an unbounded $C \subseteq \delta$ satisfying $\mathrm{otp}(C) = \delta(*)$ such that $\alpha \in C \cup \{\delta\} \Rightarrow C \cap \alpha \in \mathscr{P}_\alpha$.

3) If $\lambda > \delta(*) = \sup(A) \supseteq A$, $\mathrm{cf}(\delta(*)) = \kappa$ we define $I'[\lambda, A, \kappa]$ similarly only in $(*)'$
$C \in \mathscr{P}_\delta$ and $\{\mathrm{otp}(\alpha \cap C) : \alpha \in C, C \cap \alpha \in \mathscr{P}_\alpha\} \supseteq A$.
4) Also for $D \subseteq \mathscr{P}(\delta(*)), \emptyset \in D$ we can define $I'[\lambda, D, \kappa]$.

5.3 Fact: 1) In $(*)$ of the Definition 5.2(1), the demand $\mathrm{otp}(C) < \delta$ gives an equivalent definition (i.e. by closing $\mathscr{P}_\alpha$ as in [Sh 420, §1]).
2) $I'[\lambda]$ is a normal ideal on $\lambda, \subseteq I[\lambda]$.
3) If λ is a successor of regular cardinals then $\{\delta < \lambda : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) < \lambda\} \in I'[\lambda]$.

5.4 Observation. If $\lambda > \kappa$ are regular then λ accepts (μ, κ).

5.5 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) $\lambda > \mu > \kappa$ *and* $\mu^\kappa < \lambda$
- (b) λ *x-accepts* (μ, D) *where* D *is a filter on* κ *which is regular* $\subseteq \mathscr{P}(\kappa)$
- (c) $\{\delta < \mu : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \kappa\} \neq \emptyset \bmod D$
- (d) D^* *is a filter on* $[\mu]^\kappa, \emptyset \notin D^*$ *such that: if* $\lambda_i \in \mathrm{Reg} \cap \lambda \backslash \mu^+$ *for* $i < \mu$, *then* $\{a \in [\mu]^\kappa : \max \mathrm{pcf}\{\lambda_i : i \in a\} > \lambda\}$ *belongs to* D^*.

Then we can find $\bar{\mathscr{F}} = \langle \mathscr{F}_\alpha : \alpha \in S^\lambda_\kappa \rangle$ *such that*

- $\circledast_{\bar{\mathscr{F}}}$ (α) $\mathscr{F}_\alpha \subseteq \{f : f$ *a partial function from* α *to* $\alpha, \mathrm{Dom}(f)$ *is an unbounded subset of* α *of order type* $\kappa\}$
- (β) $|\mathscr{F}_\beta| < \lambda$ *if* $x = wk, |\mathscr{F}_\beta| \leq |\beta|$ *if* $x = \mathrm{md}, |\mathscr{F}_\beta| \leq 1$ *if* $x = \mathrm{st}$
- (γ) *if* $g \in {}^\lambda\lambda$ *and* E *is a club of* λ, *then for some* $\delta \in E, \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \kappa$ *and* $f \in \mathscr{F}_\alpha$ *we have* $f \subseteq g$ *(can say "many").*

Proof. Let $\langle \mathscr{P}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ witness that λ accept (μ, D).
Let pr:$\lambda \times \lambda \to \lambda$ be one to one and let

$$\mathscr{F}^*_\alpha = \{f : f \text{ is a partial function from } \alpha \text{ to } \alpha \text{ with domain an unbounded subset of } \alpha \text{ of order type } \kappa\}$$

$$\mathscr{F}_\alpha = \{f \in \mathscr{F}^*_\alpha : \text{ the set } \{pr(\beta, f(\beta)) : \beta \in \mathrm{Dom}(f)\} \text{ belongs to } \mathscr{P}_\alpha\}.$$

Given $g \in {}^\lambda\lambda$ let $E = \{\delta :$ if $\alpha < \delta$ then $\sup\{f(\beta) : \beta \leq \alpha\} < \delta\}$.
$Ag = \{pr(\beta, g(\beta)) : \beta < \lambda\}$ and apply the definition 5.1.

Discussion: Now from the medium case, for cofinalities $< \beth_\omega$ get a conclusion concerning the few-branches-property.

§6 Relatives of ♣

6.1 Claim. *Assume*

(a) $\lambda = \mu^+$
(b) $\kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\mu) < \mu$
(c) $\kappa \neq \theta = \mathrm{cf}(\theta) < \mu$
(d) $S \subseteq S^\lambda_\theta$ *is stationary and* S *has the* κ*-middle diamond.*

Then there is $\bar{A} = \langle A^*_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ *such that:*

(A) $A_\alpha \subseteq \delta, |A_\alpha| < \mu$
(B) *for every unbounded* $\delta \in S$ *we have* $\delta = \sup(A^*_\delta \cap A)$
(C) *if* $f : \lambda \to \lambda$ *then for stationarily many* $\delta \in S, \delta = \sup\{\alpha \in C_\alpha : f(\alpha) \in A_\alpha\}$.

Proof. Let $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ has the κ-middle diamond.

We define a function $\mathbf{F}$, more exactly $\bar{\mathbf{F}} = \langle \mathbf{F}_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$

$$\mathrm{Dom}(\mathbf{F}_\alpha) = \{f : f \text{ a two-place function from } C_\delta \text{ to } \kappa\}$$

$$\mathbf{F}_\alpha(f) = \ \mathrm{Min}\{i : (\forall \alpha \in C_\alpha)(\exists \beta)(\alpha < \beta \in C_\alpha)[f(\alpha,\beta) \leq i]\}.$$

Note that $\mathbf{F}_\alpha(f)$ is well defined as $\kappa \neq \theta$. So by assumption (d) we can find $\langle i^*_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ such that

(α) $i^*_\delta < \mu$
(β) for every $f : \lambda \times \lambda \to \kappa$ for stationary many $\delta \in S$ we have $i^*_\delta = \mathbf{F}_\delta(f \restriction C_\delta)$.

Let $\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa\rangle$ be an increasing continuous sequence of cardinals $< \mu$ with limit $\mu, \lambda_0 > \kappa + 0$.

For each $\alpha < \lambda$ let $\langle B_{\alpha,i} : i < \kappa\rangle$ be an increasing continuous sequence of subsets of α with union α such that $|B_{\alpha,i}| \leq \lambda_i$. At last we define $\bar{A} = \langle A_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ by

$$A_\delta = \{A_{\alpha, i^*_\delta} : \alpha \in C_\delta\}.$$

Let us prove that $\bar{A}$ is as required so we are given $A \subseteq \lambda = \sup(A)$. We define a function $f_A : \lambda \times \lambda \to \kappa$ by $\alpha < \beta < \lambda$ we let $f_A(\alpha,\beta) = \ \mathrm{Min}\{i : A \cap (\alpha,\beta) \neq \emptyset\}$ and let $E = \{\delta < \lambda : \delta$ a limit ordinal and $\delta = \sup(A \cap \delta)\}$ clearly a club of λ. Now if $\delta \in S \cap E$ and $i^*_\delta = \mathbf{F}_\delta(f_A \restriction C_\delta)$ then $\delta = \sup(A_\delta \cap A)$; so clearly we are done.

6.2 Remark. Unfortunately, we do not know to find such $\bar{A}$ with $\sup\{|A_\delta| : \delta \in S\} < \mu$; see [`DjSh:xxx`] why consistently at least for some such λ this is inherent. ? DjSh:xxx ? Maybe we can use squared middle diamond for each λ_i, seem doubtful.

6.3 Claim. *Assume*

(a) $S \subseteq S^\lambda_\theta$ *is stationary*

(b) $\bar{\mathscr{P}} = \langle \mathscr{P}_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle, \mathscr{P}_\delta \subseteq \{B : B \subseteq \delta$ *is unbounded and* $\operatorname{otp}(B) = \theta\}$

(c) *if* $A \subseteq \lambda = \sup(A)$ *then* $\{\delta \in S : (\exists B \in \mathscr{P}_\delta)(B \subseteq A)\}$ *is a stationary subset of* λ

(d) $\lambda = \mu^+, \theta \neq \operatorname{cf}(\mu), (\forall \alpha < \mu)(|\alpha|^\theta < \mu)$ *(more?)*

(e) $|\mathscr{P}_\delta| \leq \mu_*, \mu > \mu_* \geq \theta, \mu$ *strong limit or just* $(\forall \alpha < \mu)(|\alpha|^{(>\mu_*)^+} < \mu)$.

Then $\clubsuit_S$.

Proof. We use a coding to $(2^{\mu_*})^+$-tuples, not all tuples can be coded so we allow. So by this we consider $\mathscr{P}_\delta$ as a $\{\langle a_{\delta,j,i} : i < (2^{\mu_*})^+\rangle : j < \mu_*\}$.
Each i given an equivalence relation $E_{\delta,i}$ on i, one X appear $(2^{\mu_*})^+$. Use $*$ outside X in X.

§7 Successor of singular strong limit and being Jonsson

This is a try

7.1 Claim. *Assume* $\kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\mu) < \mu, \kappa \neq \theta_1 = \mathrm{cf}(\theta_1) < \mu, \mu > \mathrm{cf}(\theta_2) = \theta_2 \to (\theta_1)^2_\kappa$ *and* $S^* \subseteq S^*_{\theta_2}, S^* \in I[\lambda]$ *and*

- (a) *we can find* $\langle S^*_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ *and* $\langle a^i_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$
- (b) $a^i_\alpha \subseteq \alpha, |a^i_\alpha| \leq \lambda_i < \mu$
- (c) *for a club of* $\delta \in S^*$, *for a club of* $\alpha < \delta$ *of cofinality* θ_1 *we can find an increasing continuous sequence* $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta_1 \rangle$ *with limit* α *and* $b_i \subseteq \theta_1$ *for* $i < \kappa$ *with* $\theta_1 = \cup\{b_i : i < \kappa\}$ *such that*
  - $\circledast$ *for each* i *and* $\varepsilon < \zeta$ *from* $b_i, \alpha_\varepsilon \in a^i_{\alpha_\zeta}$.

Proof. See x.x (or earlier better claim using a scale $\bar{f}$ which obeys A, so θ_2 disappears?)

7.2 Claim. *Assume*

- $(*)$ $\lambda = \mu^+, \kappa = \mathrm{cf}(\mu) < \mu, \theta = \mathrm{cf}(\theta), (\forall \alpha < \mu)(|\alpha|^\theta < \mu)$ *and 7.1's conclusion.*

<u>*Then*</u> *we can find* $\langle b_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ *with union* $\{\delta < \theta : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) \neq \kappa\}$ *and for each* $i < \theta$ *a partial square* $\langle a^i_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$

- (α) $a^i_\alpha \subseteq i, |a^i_\alpha| < \theta, \beta \in a^i_\alpha \Rightarrow a^i_\beta = \beta \cap a^i$
- (β) *for any club* E *of* λ *for some increasing continuous* $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta \rangle$ *we have* $\zeta \in b_i \Rightarrow a^i_{\alpha_\zeta} = \{\alpha_\varepsilon\}$.

Proof. Similarly.

7.3 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) $\lambda, \kappa, \mu, \theta$ *as in 7.2,* $\kappa > \aleph_0$ *and* $(\forall \alpha < \mu)(|\alpha|^\theta < \mu)$
- (b) $\langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ *and* b *as in 7.2 ?*

A try: Let $S_1 \subseteq S^\lambda_\kappa$ be a stationary subset reflecting in $S^\lambda_\theta, \bar{C}^1 = \langle C^1_\delta : \delta \in S\rangle$ strict club system $(\mathrm{otp}(C_\delta) = \kappa, \langle \mathrm{cf}(\alpha) : \alpha \in C_\delta\rangle)$ is increasing with limit $\kappa < \theta = \mathrm{cf}(\theta) < \mu$. But can we demand $\bar{C}$ is tree like?

Case 1: For every club E of λ for some sequence $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta\rangle$ increasing continuous, $\alpha_\varepsilon \in E$ and the following set is stationary

$$c_{\bar{\alpha}} = \big\{\varepsilon < \theta : \alpha_\varepsilon \in S \wedge C_{\alpha_\varepsilon} \subseteq^* E \wedge c_{\alpha_\varepsilon} \not\subseteq^* \cup\{c_{\alpha_\zeta} : \zeta \in \varepsilon \cap S\}\big\}.$$

Then $\lambda \to [\lambda]^{<\omega}_\theta$ (reasonably also $\lambda > [\lambda]^2_\theta$) as in [Sh:g].

Case 2: Not Case 1 and $\bar{c}$ is tree like.

7.4 Definition. Let μ, σ, θ be cardinals, C a set of ordinals and $\mathscr{A}$ a family of subsets of C.
1) For any set $\mathscr{S} \subseteq \{\bar{\eta} : \bar{\eta} = \langle \eta_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu\rangle$ and $\eta_\varepsilon \in {}^c\sigma\}$ and $\mathscr{F} \subseteq \{\mathbf{F} : \mathbf{F}$ is a function from c_σ to $\theta\}$.
We define a game $\Game = \Game(\mu, \sigma, \theta, \mathscr{S}, \mathscr{F})$ between Md and unif. A play last μ moves, in the ε-th move first the Md-player chooses $\mathbf{F}_\varepsilon \in \mathscr{F}$ and $j_\varepsilon < \theta$ the unif player chooses $\eta_\varepsilon \in {}^c\sigma$.

In the end the Md-player wins if $\langle \eta_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta\rangle \notin \mathscr{S}$ or $(\exists \varepsilon < \mu)(j_\varepsilon = \mathbf{F}_\varepsilon(\eta_\varepsilon))$.
2) Assume $\mathscr{A} \subseteq \mathscr{P}(C), \mathscr{S} \subseteq \{\bar{\eta} : \bar{\eta} = \langle \eta_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu\rangle$ and each η_ε is a partial function from C to σ, $\mathrm{Dom}(\eta_\varepsilon) \in \mathscr{A}\}, \mathbf{F} \subseteq \{\mathbf{F} : \mathbf{F}$ a function from ${}^A\sigma$ to θ for some $A \in \mathscr{A}\}$ the game $\Game(\mu, \sigma, \theta, \mathscr{A}, \mathscr{S}, \mathscr{F})$ is defined similarly.

A play last μ moves, in the ε-th move first the MD-player chooses $A_\varepsilon \in \mathscr{A}, \bar{\mathbf{F}}_\varepsilon \in \mathscr{F}$ with domain ${}^{(A_\varepsilon)}\sigma$ and j_ε and second the unif-player chooses $\eta_\varepsilon \in {}^{(A_\varepsilon)}\sigma$. In the end of the play the Md-player wins if $\langle \eta_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mu\rangle \notin \mathscr{S}$ or $(\exists \varepsilon)(\mathbf{F}_\varepsilon(\eta_\varepsilon) = j_\varepsilon)$.

REFERENCES.

[AShS 221] Uri Abraham, Saharon Shelah, and R. M. Solovay. Squares with diamonds and Souslin trees with special squares. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, **127**:133–162, 1987.

[CDSh 571] James Cummings, Mirna Džamonja, and Saharon Shelah. A consistency result on weak reflection. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, **148**:91–100, 1995. math.LO/9504221.

[DvSh 65] Keith J. Devlin and Saharon Shelah. A weak version of $\diamondsuit$ which follows from $2^{\aleph_0} < 2^{\aleph_1}$. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **29**:239–247, 1978.

[DjSh 691] Mirna Džamonja and Saharon Shelah. Weak reflection at the successor of a singular cardinal. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, **accepted**. math.LO/0003118.

[DjSh 562] Mirna Džamonja and Saharon Shelah. On squares, outside guessing of clubs and $I_{<f}[\lambda]$. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, **148**:165–198, 1995. math.LO/9510216.

[EK] Ryszard Engelking and Monika Karłowicz. Some theorems of set theory and their topological consequences. *Fundamenta Math.*, **57**:275–285, 1965.

[J] Thomas Jech. *Set theory*. Academic Press, New York, 1978.

[Sh 638] Saharon Shelah. More on Weak Diamond. *The East-West Journal of Mathematics*, **accepted**. math.LO/9807180.

[Sh 513] Saharon Shelah. pcf and infinite free subsets in an algebra. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, **accepted**. math.LO/9807177.

[Sh 667] Saharon Shelah. Successor of singulars: combinatorics and not collapsing cardinals $\leq \kappa$ in $(< \kappa)$-support iterations. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **accepted**. math.LO/9808140.

[Sh 755] Saharon Shelah. Weak Diamond. *Mathematica Japonica*, **submitted**. math.LO/0107207.

[Sh 108] Saharon Shelah. On successors of singular cardinals. In *Logic Colloquium '78 (Mons, 1978)*, volume 97 of *Stud. Logic Foundations Math*, pages 357–380. North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1979.

[Sh 208] Saharon Shelah. More on the weak diamond. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, **28**:315–318, 1985.

[Sh 237e] Saharon Shelah. Remarks on squares. In *Around classification theory of models*, volume 1182 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 276–279. Springer, Berlin, 1986.

[Sh 351] Saharon Shelah. Reflecting stationary sets and successors of singular cardinals. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, **31**:25–53, 1991.

[Sh 420] Saharon Shelah. Advances in Cardinal Arithmetic. In *Finite and Infinite Combinatorics in Sets and Logic*, pages 355–383. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993. N.W. Sauer et al (eds.).

[Sh:g] Saharon Shelah. *Cardinal Arithmetic*, volume 29 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. Oxford University Press, 1994.

[Sh 430] Saharon Shelah. Further cardinal arithmetic. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **95**:61–114, 1996. math.LO/9610226.

[Sh 462] Saharon Shelah. On σ-entangled linear orders. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, **153**:199–275, 1997. math.LO/9609216.

[Sh:f] Saharon Shelah. *Proper and improper forcing*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer, 1998.

[Sh 589] Saharon Shelah. Applications of PCF theory. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **65**:1624–1674, 2000.

[Sh 460] Saharon Shelah. The Generalized Continuum Hypothesis revisited. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **116**:285–321, 2000. math.LO/9809200.

[Sh 576] Saharon Shelah. Categoricity of an abstract elementary class in two successive cardinals. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **126**:29–128, 2001. math.LO/9805146.